

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 2.

MAY 1929.

VOL. XIX.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

CATHOLIC EMANCIPATION.

Catholic Emancipation in 1829 was a notable event, and Catholics are entitled to celebrate its centenary with pride and satisfaction. Mr. Denis Gwynn¹ has written an interesting history of the hundred years that have now elapsed, and his book deserves a wider circulation than merely amongst his co-religionists. One notable point brought out by this work is that the influence of the Oxford Movement upon the extension of Roman Catholicism in England can easily be exaggerated. Whereas Wiseman and a few others shared the dream that the return of England to the Old Faith would come through the Catholicizing of the Established Church by the movement which Newman and Pusey had led at Oxford, the expansion of Catholicism was in fact due to a vast Irish immigration. The year which saw Newman's conversion 'was the first of the three years of devastating famine in Ireland, which sent literally hundreds of thousands of starving Catholic refugees flocking onto England.' 'The overwhelmingly Irish character of the Catholic Church in England in the decades after the Irish famine is a matter of history which has been strangely ignored.' Even Manning, in the very last entry in the diary which he kept for so many years, said that his chief sacrifice in becoming Catholic was that he 'ceased to work for the people of England and had thenceforward to work for the Irish occupation of England.'

¹*A Hundred Years of Catholic Emancipation.* (Longman's: 10/6.)

Newman was less at home in the new environment. If he could, he would have made English Romanism a home for intellectuals like himself; but traditions were too strong. Readers of Mr. Lytton Strachey's brilliant essay know how vainly he beat his head against the wall of jealousy and prejudice that confronted him. Manning, at Westminster, chose the more excellent way, and became a demagogue. That the results of the Irish diaspora were not temporary Mr. Gwynn's map on p. xxxii indicates. The areas of maximum Catholic density are Lancashire, the West Riding of Yorkshire, and the county of Durham; Cheshire, Birmingham, and the eastward environs of London come second; but one might travel through the non-industrial areas from Penzance to Cromer and not meet a Catholic. Glasgow also is a prolific area, transformed religiously and racially since the war by Irish immigration.

One notes that Mr. Gwynn's hopes of further expansion are based chiefly on a differential birth-rate. This is a more potent factor than reason in the conversion of mankind. 'The most important cause of Catholic expansion in Great Britain has undoubtedly been the prevalence of large families among the Catholic poor.' Indeed, he quotes Dean Inge's hopeful remark that we have more to expect from Catholic propagation than from Catholic propaganda. Nor are Catholics blind to the advantages of numbers in a country of democratic institutions. 'In an age of universal suffrage, and of popular institutions, the argument of numbers is unanswerable.' Already politicians, as we know, are terrified of the Catholic vote, both at home and to an even greater extent in the Dominions. And now that the solved Irish Question has left an open field for agitation, we may look for interesting developments in the field of education, the censorship, marriage laws, and so on.

But since the birth-rate extension has been introduced, it should be noted that even Catholics are not without misgivings with regard to it. Mr. Gwynn says:

'Probably the most serious present cause of leakage (*i.e.* from Catholicism) is the growing practice of family limitation among all classes and the acute difficulty created, for those who have large families, by the shortage of houses and the smallness of the new type of house. In Scotland the prevalence of 'birth-control' propaganda has been so serious that two years ago the whole hierarchy found it

necessary to issue a joint pastoral letter reminding their people of the Church's uncompromising condemnation of artificial birth prevention' (p. 283).

The Rev. Herbert Thurston, S.J., writes to somewhat the same effect in the essay, on 'The Statistical Progress of the Church,' which he contributes to the volume recently published with an Introduction by Cardinal Bourne, *Catholic Emancipation* (Longman's, 10/6):

'Of still greater importance (he writes) is the question of birth restriction. This, it is to be feared, is not unknown even in Catholic families, but it is quite well understood even by the most uneducated that the practice is condemned by the Church.'

Father Thurston's essay throughout is studiously moderate. He gives figures which

'would imply that, while other denominations are demonstrably losing ground, the Catholic Church is not only keeping abreast of the increase of the population, but distinctly gaining upon it.'

There is much in these essays that deserves extensive comment, but a couple of points only can be singled out. In his admirable survey of the Church's attitude (in England) towards Science, Sir Bertram C. A. Windle has no difficulty in showing that in philology, geology, anthropology, astronomy, and in various branches of biology, Catholics have made notable contributions to the natural sciences. It is indeed probable that an orthodox Catholic finds it considerably easier to combine a practising piety with scientific research (*e.g.* Pasteur, Mendel, etc.) than would a Fundamentalist Protestant. Yet something should have been said also upon *historical* science. The study, let us say, of the history of dogmas and institutions; or the critical study of the New Testament documents. But even here we cannot decently adopt airs of superiority over Catholics, since even in our own Church a scientific candour in these spheres is not too common. The student must often take his ecclesiastical life in his hand.

Mr. Chesterton, in his customarily brilliant essay, 'The Outlook,' makes much play with the statement that England, though not yet Catholic, is no longer Protestant—it no longer believes the doctrines of the seventeenth, or even of the nineteenth, century. This is only too true, and a great deal of ill-informed and unintelligent bigotry and prejudice has, we should hope, insensibly evaporated. Yet the fact that Protest-

antism is dead does not mean that Catholicism is alive. The short and the long of it is that we are arrived at a point when another move is due, but creative genius in the religious sphere works at present under such restrictions that possibilities are confined to a minimum. To-day religion suffers under much the same handicaps as afflicted science in the days of Roger Bacon, and is hardly more progressive. We dwell incarcerated in a prison of the mind and imagination; hence a prevailing inanition due to gaol-fever. Mr. Chesterton proposes to benefit us by double-locking the doors.

THE CHELTENHAM CONFERENCE.

Readers of the *Modern Churchman* will have perused in the press the findings of the Conference held recently at St. Peter's Hall, Oxford, under the chairmanship of the Rev. C. M. Chavasse. Most of these findings will be heartily welcomed by Modern Churchmen, and some of them are of special importance. There can be no doubt that this expression of opinion, urging as it does the present abandonment of attempts at reunion between reformed and unreformed Churches, and the recognition of the ministry of non-episcopal Churches, besides declaring that 'no dogma of Apostolic Succession should be associated with episcopacy,' will strengthen the hands of those bishops who desire to take some steps towards Reunion at Lambeth next year.

Modernists will devote special attention to the second of the nine points of this manifesto :

'That in all schemes for reunion, Holy Scripture should be accepted as the final authority in regard to faith and practice, and the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds as the summary of Catholic doctrine.'

This is consistent with the sixth Article, though it constitutes a certain advance upon the eighth Article, which mentions the Athanasian Creed and says of the three that 'they may be proved by most certain warrants of holy Scripture'—which rather questionable statement is wisely omitted in these findings.

For ourselves, though we have no desire whatever for reunion on a Fundamentalist basis, we should be content to accept the formula which regards the two Creeds as 'the summary of Catholic doctrine.' We might have been disposed to

put the indefinite for the definite article, since there might be other summaries as good, or perhaps better. Still, if liberally interpreted, most Modernists would accept the statement, realising that many of the Free Churchmen whom it is designed to attract are not less liberal than ourselves. What we are convinced of is that only reunion on a Modernist basis can be religiously fruitful.

THE MENACE OF DISESTABLISHMENT.

Under this title, the Rev. A. Fawkes contributes a forcible article to the *Quarterly Review* for April. What distinguishes Mr. Fawkes from practically all Anglican clergy is that he possesses an adequate knowledge of religious conditions upon the Continent; he *understands* contemporary Catholicism, which is a sealed book to most of our romanticists, with their dilettante antiquarianism and pious make-believe. The danger which Mr. Fawkes sees is one familiar enough to every Continental observer :

‘The real question is this : Are Church and State to be driven into opposition by rash and ill-advised action? It is well to remember that in great countries on the continent of Europe, Church and State are more or less in continual conflict, or in a condition of armed neutrality in relation to one another. The Church comes, in such circumstances, to be regarded by great numbers as a vast conspiracy against the liberties of the nation.’

Occasions might arise, no doubt, when the Church would be right as against the State—and it is possible that in the not distant future the State may make claims on its citizens with which no Christian could comply. And then will be the time for our believers in ‘inherent spiritual authority’ to disobey the State and go to prison or face the firing-squad. There will then be something in the business—something at stake. But the trouble with our inherent spiritual authoritarians at present is that they are only brave over trifles. They make a great song over the right to teach fables to immature children, or to resuscitate mediaeval liturgical practices; but if it were a question of denouncing the bombing of enemy non-combatants, we should find them silent. They will leave this duty to agnostics and atheists, when the next war takes them by surprise.

Dr. Norman Sykes’ article, ‘A Defence of the Present Establishment of the Church of England,’ published in the

Congregational Quarterly for April, should be reprinted as a pamphlet and distributed broadcast among Free Churchmen. Most of them are blind to the fact (fully appreciated by all obscurantists and reactionaries in the Church of England) that establishment makes for comprehensiveness and freedom of thought and expression. It is the State supremacy which has invariably prevented the dominant majority from suppressing minorities. Within the limits of about 1,500 words, Dr. Sykes has put the case for the Establishment in a thoroughly cogent and effective fashion. He rightly says, *a propos* of the *impasse* created by the two Prayer Book rejections :

‘The most satisfactory solution is to make the Church more truly national in character and composition. The Church of England has owed its peculiar position among the Churches of Europe since the Reformation to its character as a National Church. The realization of its vocation depends upon its ability to maintain its comprehensiveness and its mediatory situation, and to adapt these features to the achievement of the task of home reunion.’

In short, the bishops should forget and forgive their rebuff, and turn their attention to the consolidation of English Christianity. Only such consolidation will enable it to meet the strains to which it will be subjected in the not distant future.

COCKLE-SHELL RELIGION.

At the beginning of April the Anglo-Catholic pilgrims to the Holy Land joined together in a quaint and delightful resuscitation of mediaeval custom.

‘On Monday evening (the *Church Times* tells us) a Dismissal Service was held in the Church of St. Barnabas, Pimlico. Fr. Eves sang the *Itinerarium*, and the Bishop of Willesden distributed the cockle shells, which he had first blessed and censed. In an address to the pilgrims, his lordship conveyed a message from the Archbishop of Canterbury, who sent them his blessing.’

This charming childishness is of a piece with that dilettante mediaevalism which is turning some of our cathedrals into dolls’ houses or arts and crafts emporia. Historians of religion are familiar with such phenomena, which they regard as common symptoms of spiritual decadence and decay. When we can no longer originate, we imitate—and our imitations are unconvincing. One knows not whether to smile or to sigh at these exhibitions, which betray too much to the outside world.

DR. DEARMER AND THE JESUITS.

The irrepressible Father Thurston has again been attacking Dr. Dearmer in his society's magazine; and this time *The Modern Churchman*, and Modernism in general, draws a fair amount of his fire. Evidently Dr. Dearmer unwittingly touched a tender spot when he wrote his book about fasting communion, and fasting in general. Few people even now realize upon what a basis of forgery and lying the medieval religious structure was built; and a great many Anglicans have been in the habit of accepting ancient statements at their face value. Thus, among other things, it was believed by a large section of innocent clergy that St. Paul had instituted fasting communion; and we have no doubt that some still believe it. A very good corrective to the party blindness upon which some forms of ecclesiasticism are built is the severe, impartial review of Church history in Lecky's *History of Rationalism*. It is remarkable how little that remarkable book has suffered from the sixty-four years which have elapsed since it was first published. The long passage in Chapter iv ('On Persecution'), which shows how mendacity as well as persecution grew up from the doctrine of exclusive salvation, should especially be read in this connection. There is great need at the present time for historical education; for traditional theology, stranded in the realm of science and philosophy, is tending to rest upon a very precarious basis of partizan history.

A sense of the receding tide probably accounts for Fr. Thurston's curiously bitter and ill-mannered articles. Specially written history seems, indeed, to be the last rock left to stand upon; and any attempt to let in a little light excites a remarkable amount of anger. But where is the old intellectual skill of the Jesuit order? Fr. Woodlock's criticism of the Archbishop of York in the *Spectator* a few weeks ago was a philosophical gaffe such as could surely not have happened, say, in the seventeenth century; and we cannot think that Fr. Thurston's methods of controversy do any good to his own side, or increase the popularity of his order.

RELIGION AND THE PRESS

By A. WYATT TILBY, formerly Editor of *The Outlook*.

FROM time to time some earnest clergyman feels it his duty to denounce the shamelessness of the Press; and the shameless Press promptly reports him in large type. The gratified padre, relieved to find that even Fleet Street can on occasion bring forth fruits meet for repentance, probably sends the newspaper an advance copy of his next sermon on temperance. But there are no more exhibitions of Christian humility among the ungodly. With the same promptitude and equal shamelessness, this admirable composition goes into the waste-paper basket.

The explanation is simple. The denunciation of the Press was news; for few people say what many people think. The exhortation to temperance was merely good advice; and good advice is too common a commodity to be good news.

It is sometimes forgotten that the Press is the child of the Church; the composing-room is still called the 'chapel,' in memory of Caxton and Westminster Abbey. But Mother and Son have never quite understood each other; perhaps they never can. There is, and is bound to be, a profound difference in temperament, in outlook, and appeal.

The fact that by tradition the Church appeals to authority, whereas the Press appeals to liberty, is no longer vital. Some journalists cannot understand why the clergy do not speak out; some clergy cannot understand why the journalists do not shut up. But most sensible men in both camps probably know enough of the other side of the hedge to understand that both questions can be tolerably well answered. In any event, authority is not what it was on the one side; nor liberty on the other. (Divorce reports are now forbidden by law, and the public has to satisfy its pornographic instincts through novels, not newspapers. Hence, no doubt, the increased demand for the dirty drawing-room style of fiction.)

But the real divergence between the Church and the newspaper Press is a fundamental difference of outlook. The Church is properly concerned with eternity, and temporal things have value and significance only in so far as they are relative to the

absolute and unseen. But the Press is properly concerned only with temporal happenings; time is its absolute, yesterday its standard of reference, to-morrow its unseen. It does not, of course, deny the existence of eternity any more than the clergyman denies the existence of time; but its business is the world of current events, the tremendous or trivial happenings of the hour. If these happen to touch on the permanent problems of the Church, then religion comes into the news; if not, then religion is left to the pulpit, and the sermons are unreported.

Of late, as everyone has noticed, there has been a change of attitude in the Press. Twenty years ago no secular newspaper would print an article on religion; now it actually demands them. The reasons for this new standpoint are complex.

There was no anti-religious prejudice in the older attitude; the idea that newspapers were run by Jews or Jesuits to corrupt an honest Protestant public was pure myth. The objection to religious articles was entirely practical. In the first place, a secular newspaper was not considered a suitable medium for a discussion on, say, the Apostolic Succession or Baptismal Regeneration. In the second place, only a minority of the public was interested in these things, but that minority was found to be extremely suspicious and intolerant, and always ready to accuse the editor of bigotry, unfairness, or fanaticism. In the third place, the much-abused editor was probably ignorant and possibly indifferent as to the merits of the controversy: so, like a prudent Gallio, he avoided further trouble by classing 'church questions' with anti-vivisection and anti-vaccination as more bother than they were worth, and returned to the familiar field of politics in which, by temperament and training, he was an expert. If people really wanted to quarrel about creeds and confessions of faith, the correspondence columns were open. But the editorial columns were closed.

Since the war, however, things have changed with the Press both internally and externally. Owing to increased costs of production, the number of newspapers has declined, and circulations have largely increased; a development which has entailed certain definite results. The newspaper trade now requires large capital resources, with the result that it tends to be more conservative—not necessarily in the political sense—and

cautious; it will not willingly take the unpopular side. A newspaper's revenue is derived from advertisements, the charge for which depends on the size of the circulation; it is therefore less likely than before to take a definite line which would alienate its readers, who are of all classes and creeds. This complicated commercial organization has consequently to influence without offending public opinion; and it has found a way of doing so.

It is studiously moderate in its leading columns, which reflect the official opinion of the paper; but it allows a greater latitude to contributors who sign their articles, and whose opinions on matters of current interest can be replied to by some rival gladiator while the editor holds the ring. The public is instructed, or at least informed; the paper remains uncommitted to either extreme; and the irate correspondent discharges his wrath on the contributors, while the editor lives in peace.

So much for the internal change. But a newspaper is, or should be, a reflection of the mind of the public, and apart from actual news—where intrinsic importance is the only proper test of the length it occupies—it allots space to subjects in proportion to the general interest in those subjects. Judged by that basis, we find that interest in politics is everywhere on the decline, both as regards home and foreign affairs. It revived momentarily under the Labour Government of 1924, diminished with the Electricity Act in 1927, and fell nearly to zero under the 1928 De-Rating Measure. Against this, interest in sport of all kinds tended to increase almost immediately after the end of the war; then a year or so later religion followed suit; and finally the Stock Exchange. An odd trio; to which may be added still more recently a revival of interest in literature.

The average editor included religion rather reluctantly in his menu; he felt somewhat like the captain of a liner with a cargo of unknown composition on board. If it turned out to be ballast, he did not want it; if dynamite, the passengers would probably object. He found to his surprise that it was extremely popular; it gave the passengers something to talk about on those dull days when the world seems to stand still and nothing happens except the normal, which is not news at all. The public had changed its mind, and instead of abusing the newspaper, as heretofore, it wrote letters of appreciation and thanks.

There were, however, perplexing features about the revival. The news columns showed Bishops complaining that the public was 'steeped in materialism,' and the rank-and-file of the clergy bewailing the empty benches; while the correspondence columns showed that an article on religion elicited more response than an article on politics. But the paradox was not difficult to explain once it was examined. Rightly or wrongly, the public believed that the clergy were giving them 'the mixture as before' in the pulpit, and that the editors were giving them the same in their politics. The result was that only the old guard of religion went to church, and only the old guard of politics read the partisan leading article.

The younger generation, in politics as in religion, has repudiated party ties and party discipline. It is not merely suspicious of orthodoxy; it is contemptuous. But this does not mean that it has thrown off politics or religion, simply that it does not believe the old solutions. Its interest in the main is intellectual, not emotional, and therefore it is sceptical of the constituted authorities, unless they can put up so good a defence that even adverse bias owns itself corrected.

In a situation of this kind, the Press has obvious advantages over the parson. I imagine it would be difficult for a clergyman to express himself in favour of Reincarnation in the pulpit. But an editor can publish an article on Reincarnation one week, and another on the other side next week. It is obviously impossible for an Anglican priest to ask Father Woodlock to preach in his church. But nothing is easier than for an editor to ask Father Woodlock to write an article, and even those who are technically Protestants will read him with interest, for they know that some sturdy Evangelical will triumphantly expose his subtle errors a few days later. It is like eating an ice with a savoury to follow; each digests the other.

It is difficult to see how this situation can be changed. The clergyman must be a propagandist, and the world is sick of propaganda. The newspaper must be free, and the world is in love with freedom. A solution in which the Churches retain the old, while the newspapers obtain the young, is no solution at all; for there is no indication whatever that the young will desert the newspaper for the Church when they are middle-aged.

It will be said in reply that the newspaper does not convert men. It does not want to; but do people any longer want to be converted? The repentant drunkard and the wife-beater, yes; but the ordinary decent fellow who takes his family for a run on Sunday morning, listens-in to the hymns and anthem on Sunday evening, maintains an embarrassed silence during the prayers, and shuts off for the sermon? But this ordinary prosperous pagan reads the newspaper; will certainly read an article on Prayers for the Dead with attention; will probably run through an article on Reservation of the Sacrament with mild interest; and will assuredly skip any merely devotional column that mentions 'the Blood of the Lamb' or any similar phraseology with instant decision and distaste.

That brings us to one of the roots of the trouble. The old expressions are losing their force. No city-born child could possibly think of God as a shepherd, of Christ as a lamb, or the Holy Ghost as a dove. He may be taught these things, but they simply make the whole thing seem remote and therefore unreal. Some children's hymns, too, are ridiculous. In the days when good little boys were seen and not heard there may have been some point in 'We are but little children weak.' But to see a parcel of restive boys from a preparatory school set to sing this lugubrious composition is to experience emotions the very reverse of reverent. I should doubt, too, whether 'Gentle Jesus, meek and mild' makes the slightest appeal to-day as an ideal figure.

On the other hand, I have heard of boys being extremely interested in the question whether Christ had a fair trial; why He did not defend Himself as vigorously as did Paul; and whether Pilate should not have adjourned the case for further evidence. If laymen can discuss these subjects with an open mind over coffee and cigars, I do not see why the clergy should not do it in the pulpit. The Bible is full of difficult ethical problems, from Jacob's deception—where honesty was certainly not the best policy—onwards, and people will follow an ethical argument addressed to the head where a merely emotional appeal addressed to the heart leaves them cold or even slightly repelled. All that is needed is a certain freshness and frankness of treatment. In that respect, again, the newspaper has

outrun the Church, because it is less bound by convention. The Church has to proselytize; the newspaper can afford to be pragmatic.

These points, it is true, are only details; and behind these details lies the real problem, whether the actual values are not changing as well as the symbols and the phraseology. It is the business of men concerned with newspapers to know what the public are thinking about. The fact that they give space to religion is proof enough that the public are thinking about religion, but the treatment of the subject is significant. Few devotional articles are published; the limited public which requires that type of literature is assumed to be sufficiently catered for in Lenten manuals. A fair proportion of controversial articles are published, because the public loves a fight; and an ecclesiastical fight, unlike an industrial fight, has the singular advantage from the lay point of view that nobody is a penny the worse—it is a unique entertainment that does not have to be paid for. But by far the largest number of articles published are those which deal with religion as an intellectual interest; its historic solutions as they appear in the light of the world to-day.

Here, too, the newspaper has a definite advantage over the Church. It is bound to devote a small proportion of space to scientific progress, which is news; it is practically bound to publish an occasional article in comment or explanation of new discoveries in that field. Many readers perhaps take these things merely at their face value, and many more no doubt give them merely a cursory glance before they turn to the produce or the police reports. But a considerable residue remains who digest these things carefully; and this intelligent minority can see without being told that new discoveries in physics affect traditional ideas in philosophy, and eventually in religion.

It is easy for a newspaper to point this out from time to time, and if it is sufficiently enterprising it will get up a symposium in which recognized authorities discuss re-interpretation from their different points of view. A newspaper like the *Daily News*, which appeals generally to the Evangelical and Nonconformist public, has for instance no hesitation in publishing an article by Sir Arthur Keith arguing that human personality does not survive death, and following it up with a reply by Mr. Ches-

terton in which the Roman Catholic attitude is naturally elaborated. But no Low Church clergyman—or Anglo-Catholic for that matter—could follow suit in the pulpit.

These discussions arise naturally out of a newspaper's necessity to comment on the news; the best comment on a subject that is exercising the public mind is made by an expert, and the public will listen to him with respect if not with agreement. The parish priest obviously cannot have these resources at hand, and now that everybody reads the newspapers, he suffers in the comparison.

It is perfectly true that new ideas take a very long time to become part of the ordinary mental equipment of the average man. But it is usually true that he is aware that the old landmarks are being washed away; and even if the flood passes, and they reappear, they are somehow changed and diminished in importance. He is aware that the newspapers more or less attempt to keep him in touch with these developments, and to explain their effect on the world of philosophy and religion. Can it be said that the Churches are doing the same? I understand that the pulpit successfully cultivates a virtue which has never been excessively honoured in the Press—reticence and reserve on difficult issues.

But in the present case the newspapers seem to have found it worth while to invade the field which they formerly were content to leave to the universities and the clergy, and they are not likely to abandon it. They give their readers what they want; and what they want appears to be the frankest possible discussion of every controversial issue under the sun.

There are no *choses jugées* to-day, merely provisional standpoints. The public will listen to anybody so long as he is sincere and not tedious. But he must have something to say; he must rest his case on argument, not authority—an appeal to 'the faith of our fathers' probably prejudices a cause at the present moment—and he must be ready to admit that there is something in the other man's point of view. The Press has quite frankly adopted the attitude of the open mind towards problems old and new, and has found it successful.

THE CHURCH OF SHAKESPEARE

By the REV. EDGAR I. FRIPP, B.A., Author of *Master Richard Quyny, Bailiff of Stratford-upon-Avon and Friend of William Shakespeare*; *Shakespeare's Stratford*; Editor of *Minutes and Accounts of the Corporation of Stratford-upon-Avon, 1553—1620*; Life Trustee of Shakespeare's Birthplace.

SHAKESPEARE belongs to the Middle Ages, to the Reformation, and to the Renaissance; and it would be difficult to say to which of these three he owes most. He is Gothic—he discards classical rules, burlesques the Homeric heroes; his dramas are sometimes (like *Macbeth*) magnificent ‘moralities,’ and always contain much of the ‘morality’ symbolism; his English history, and view of English history, are mediaeval; he loves the old architecture, and Church offices and furniture, wayside crosses, chalices, patens; he has more than a kindly feeling for friars; he is profoundly religious, in spirit and atmosphere, like a cathedral, without theological dogma, and in spirituality, again and again, is akin to Dante. But also he is Humanist—in his love of Ovid, and of the pagan mythology as revealed in the *Metamorphoses*, in his sympathy with all sorts and conditions of men, with the voluptuous as well as the wise, in his licence and coarseness as well as his exquisite refinement, his faith in nature and knowledge. Again, he is Protestant—he knows his Bible from end to end, his metrical psalms, his Catechism; is Calvinist and necessarian, and a believer in grace, leaving free-will to villains like Iago and Edmund; is anti-Romanist in politics, a believer in the divine right of the Crown as against that of the Pope; and as he grows older, and the times grow dissipated, his judgment is less indulgent, his consciousness of sin is deeper and darker, and his heroines are puritan.

With this Protestantism of the Poet I am concerned in this article. I will endeavour to see him as a son of the English Church, in its development and varying phases from his childhood to his death.

¹ Objectionable, no doubt, to the ‘modern’ mind, as in the character of Hecate.

For the English Church at this period was very far from *one*, either in belief or practice, policy or fellowship. Few subjects are more complicated or more interesting, or farther reaching, not only for students of Shakespeare, but for modern Churchmen. The English Church which gave us Shakespeare is of primary significance for those who would have again, I won't say the lawlessness and nonconformity and contention which characterised it, but its latitude, comprehensiveness, variety and salutary clashing of brains. If ever the English Church is to be again the loved religious home of men and women of Shakespeare's breadth and depth, it must be inclusive and open its doors to every form of Christian earnestness, and for that end concentrate its attention not on creeds however venerable, but on the central symbol, which is older and more venerable still, and everlasting, the Lord's Prayer.

The story of the National Church of Shakespeare's time may be divided into four chapters, occupying the years (a) 1558-1571, (b) 1572-1590, (c) 1593-1603, (d) 1604-1621. The first chapter is that of 'Germanical' or Continental Protestant dominance, when leading English churchmen were returned refugees from exile, among whom non-episcopalians and non-Prayer-book men were conspicuous, in numbers, scholarship, character and influence, and indispensable in the common struggle against Romanism. From this ultra-Protestant section came in 1560 the popular Geneva Bible, the first English translation that made its way into the home. On it Shakespeare, very obviously, was brought up. With the alternate Bishops' Bible published in 1568 and authorised to be read in church he shows relatively small acquaintance. On Elizabeth's accession there was a great dearth of 'ministers' to supply the vacancies of deprived or resigned *sacerdotes*, and the new bishops, many of them exiles in Mary's reign, were not inclined to refuse ordination to young reformers of any school, or after institution to be particular about conformity. The Queen was young and for the moment powerless in the hands of her bishops and privy-council; and when at length in 1561 she moved in the matter of episcopal 'winking at schismatics and anabaptists, and great variety in ministration (a surplice may not be borne, and ministers follow the folly of the people)' she found her archbishop, Parker, very

unwilling to interfere: 'I would be sorry that the clergy should have cause to show disobedience with *oportet Deo obedire magis quam hominibus*. There be enough of this contemned stock which will not shrink to offer their blood to the defence of Christ's Verity if it be either openly impugned or secretly juggled.'²

Elizabeth's policy was to unite the kingdom against division within (as in France) and danger without, and was steady from the first, though opportunist. Like her father she would be her own pope; of a liberal temper, if Calvinist in theory, widely read and accomplished, attached to the venerable and stately forms of worship, she was neither 'Germanical' like Edward nor a devotee of the mass like Mary. Assured of the loyalty of Protestants, she would go great lengths, even to the exasperation of her supporters, to propitiate the Catholics, who were more than half the kingdom.

In 1563 Convocation published the *Articles*. They embodied the 'Germanical' theology—the Trinity, the Atonement (of God to man through Christ, not of man to God), the insufficiency of Freewill and Works without Grace, Predestination and Election, the vanity of Purgatory and Invocation of Saints, Birth (Original) Sin ('the fault and corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness and is of his own nature inclined to evil'), Justification by Faith and the Sufficiency of Scripture. Of the old seven sacraments two are 'ordained of the Gospel'—the Lord's Supper and Baptism. In the former 'the Body of Christ is given, taken and eaten only after an heavenly and spiritual manner,' and 'the mean whereby it is received is Faith.' The authority of Scripture is supreme, above that of Church, Tradition, Councils, Creeds or even these Articles. 'Whatsoever is not read therein or may be proved thereby is not to be required of any man.' On Ritual there was a sharp cleavage. In reply to the Queen's complaint to Parliament 'that every man lived as he willed without fear, and many ceremonies agreed upon were left undone or forgotten,' and 'it was necessary to banish all fear-

² *Parker* (Parker Society), 146—149, 156f (Ltn., *sugillare*, bruise, blander).

fulness for prosecuting delinquents,' resolutions were moved in the Lower House that all holy days but Sundays and the principal feasts 'be abrogate,' that in common-prayer the minister 'turn his face towards the people, not altarwards,' that the cross in baptism and kneeling at communion be left to the discretion of the ordinary, that it be enough for the minister to wear the surplice at common-prayer and the sacraments, and that organs be removed from churches. The vote, however, 43 to 35, was turned by proxies into 58 to 59.

In obedience to her Majesty, Parker began with the 'habits,' endeavouring to impose the surplice, alb and square-cap. In 1565 she bade him, hearing that 'disorders' increased rather than diminished, 'to confer' with the bishops and other head-officers, and 'cause it to be truly known what varieties, novelties and diversities there are, and to proceed so as uniformity may be kept.' Her first real, strong bid for autocratic power was the issue, without sanction of Parliament or Convocation, of the famous *Advertisements*, responsibility for which and their execution she threw upon her archbishop. Without the Queen's 'hand,' he declared, 'we will sit still,' otherwise decline to obey; 'I will no more strive against the stream, fume or chide who will.' But he did strive. Loyally if in vain he endeavoured to forward the policy of his impetuous young mistress.

A series of events kept English Protestants, like their Scottish neighbours, 'germanical.' A son and successor was born to Mary of Scots in 1566 and christened 'after the popish fashion.' This child was heir to Queen Elizabeth. In February 1567 came news of the murder of Lord Darnley, Mary's husband, the child's father. Foul whisperings were abroad, which speedily proved true, that Mary had married the murderer. In June she was imprisoned in Lochleven, in July her child was crowned King of Scotland as King James VI. In May 1568 she escaped from Lochleven, her Catholic supporters were defeated at Langside, she crossed the Solway and threw herself on the mercy of Elizabeth. For security she was brought into the Midlands, and on the outbreak of the Catholic rebellion in the North she was imprisoned in Coventry, 16 miles from Stratford. Shakespeare's father had just laid down his baili-

rick of Stratford. The Earls of Warwick and Leicester led the Queen's troops, including Warwickshire levies and chaplains, against the rebels and scattered them in December 1569. Coventry, the central city of England, and a protestant stronghold from before the Marian martyr-fires was not less protestant because of these happenings and the presbyterian principles of the lords of Kenilworth and Warwick Castles.

The rebel Earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland had written to the Pope for his benediction. Pius V replied commending their enterprise and excommunicating Elizabeth. In the meantime the Regent Murray was murdered in Linlithgow: one more of those dastardly cruelties which from Shakespeare's childhood to his writing of *Macbeth* made Scotland the byword for crime and treachery. A wave of puritan feeling passed through England. The Queen encountered the strongest opposition she had yet met with in the Parliament of 1571. It was the Parliament of the *Admonition* and the revival of the Edwardian *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, of the arrest of the member, George Strickland, and his triumphant return to the Commons. It was a critical moment. The victory of the 'germanical' party would have split the country and the Church hopelessly into opposing camps, the Queen would have lost all chance of winning the Catholics. Even the latitude or laxity hitherto enjoyed by them would be sacrificed, and any hope of an ultimate unity of Christendom in England would be abandoned. There was no alternative for her but to claim her prerogative. On May 1st she sent a message to the Speaker that she minded to publish the Articles of 1562 and enforce them in her right as Head of the Church, without Parliament.

Thus ended thirteen years of real, if not ideal Comprehension. Romanists had largely escaped penalties, and ultra-protestants had enjoyed clemency. Bishops avoided prosecution of the former and, in not a few instances, actively sympathised with the latter. This was markedly the case in the Shakespeare-country. Cheyney of Gloucester, who was too Anglican for Parker, and Sandys of Worcester and Bentham of Coventry, too 'germanical' for Parker, were content for the most part to leave 'well alone,' or rather to interfere as little as possible lest matters should be worse. Bentham's 'moderation and lenity'

were proverbial. 'I could never read nor hear,' said his puritan biographer, 'of any one in his large diocese during his nineteen or twenty years presiding there either suspended, silenced or displaced for want of subscription or conformity.' And had the puritans tolerated the Catholics they would have continued themselves to be tolerated.

The result of their intolerance was the *Book of Discipline*, and the definite division of protestants into 'puritans' (or 'precisians') and 'prelatists' (supporters of the Bishops and her Majesty). Prelatists, indeed, were few and, though influential and steadily augmented by pacified Romanists, had small chance of convincing the general body of protestants until after the death of Mary of Scots and the defeat of the Armada. Even more than Parker, Burghley supported the Queen against his own judgment and against the majority of the Privy Council, while the archbishop was little countenanced by some of his brethren. Scambler, Bishop of Peterborough, for example, was instrumental in drawing up a discipline for use in his diocese on the lines of the *Admonition* and the *Reformatio*. The mind of Parker, as of Burghley, is expressed in a letter from the one to the other in May 1572 lamenting the 'Machiavel government' of her Majesty: 'As soon is the papist favoured as the true protestant If I had not been so much bound to the Mother (Anne Boleyn) I would not so soon have granted to serve the Daughter One thing in this hurly-burly I pray your honour to let me speak to you. I am informed credibly that ye profess that ye be *at your wits' end*. Sir, let the world know no such thing. Now or never we must set out a good countenance.' Burghley had confessed, 'I am tormented with the blasts of the world. *Vita hominis est militia super terram*.' Their task was aggravated by the massacre of St. Bartholomew (August 1572). Puritan feeling was at a white heat. Sandys, now Bishop of London, advocated Mary's beheadal, the removal of all papists from Court, the unburdening of the Church of unnecessary ceremonies. Cartwright, the champion of presbyterianism, expelled for his teaching and popularity from Cambridge, became a power in the land. In March 1574 the Queen called on Parker to suppress 'prophesyings.' Gladly he would have retired to his beloved studies. He died furious with the Earl of Leicester,

as his chief opponent in the Privy Council, in May 1575. To Burghley he wrote a month previous: 'Before God, I fear that her highness' authority is not regarded. Does your lordship think that I care either for cap, tippet, surplice, or wafer-bread or any such? But for the laws so established I esteem them.'

To Parker succeeded an archbishop of tougher type, certainly not in love with presbyterianism but immovable where his conscience clashed with the dictates of her Majesty. Grindal's election in January 1576 created a vacancy at York. That month died Pilkington of Durham. Leicester hoped to fill one of these sees by the appointment of Whittingham, who replied to an invitation to Court that he was 'infirm.' In the best of health the lover of Knox would hardly have undertaken episcopal office. In Parliament in February severe things were said of bishops, and Wentworth was sent to the Tower. In April the Queen appointed her 'Grand Commission Ecclesiastical' for inquiry into disorders, and punishment of the disorderly including those who 'wilfully and obstinately absented themselves' from church. The majority of the commissioners were ready enough to run to earth the papists, a minority, of whom Whitgift was one, were eager to chase presbyterians and other protestant defaulters. In April died Bullingham of Worcester, creating a vacancy of greater moment to the Dudleys than those of Durham and York. Sandys was nominated for York, Aylmer for London in succession to Sandys, Barnes for Durham, and Whitgift for Worcester. They owed their promotion to Burghley's desire both to counterbalance the Dudley interest and to satisfy the Queen. Sandys, Aylmer and Barnes were less 'germanical' far than twenty years since, and Whitgift to the puritans was anathema.

Whitgift at Worcester 1577-1583 is an event momentous in the Shakespeare Country and in the life of John Shakespeare, the father of the Poet. The doings and troubles of this public-spirited and highly valued Alderman, as those of neighbours and colleagues in Stratford, cannot be dissociated from the espionage and martinet proceedings of the bishop and his 'trotting paritors.' Absence from church and indiscretion, not to say violence of speech at the time of 'Monsieur' and 'the French marriage' (a project which rekindled the protestant

fury of the days of the martyrs and Northern Rebellion), brought him within the power of the law and *in misericordia*. He suffered fines amounting to £40 for non-appearance at Westminster to answer for his maintenance of the Queen's Peace. Hated at Warwick Castle and Kenilworth Castle, Whitgift was not loved in Stratford or by protestants anywhere in his diocese who remembered his revered predecessors, burned at the stake for their protestantism, Bishop Latimer and Bishop Hooper. After his six years experience of the Shakespeare-country he confessed to Burghley (c. July, 1584), 'It is hard to get witnesses against the puritans *because most of the parishioners favour them and therefore will not present them nor appear against them*. If archbishops and bishops should be driven to use proofs by witnesses only, the execution of the law would be partial and their charges in procuring and producing witnesses would be intolerable.' He was then Archbishop, in succession to Grindal and determined on more drastic methods.

But after Whitgift in Warwickshire came Cartwright, as master, the loved and influential master, of Leicester's Hospital at Warwick, the darling of the Dudleys, learned, uncompromising, a powerful preacher. The whole neighbourhood was roused by his activities, his sermons, visitations, and 'synods.' One result of his presence was the remarkable 'Survey of the State of the Ministry in Warwickshire,' issued on November 2nd, 1586. It is a searching, staggering statement of the condition of the Church within and in the neighbourhood of Whitgift's recent episcopacy. We can understand from it how earnest men might regard the Queen's policy as 'peace at any price.' One of the clergy whom Whitgift would have silenced (and perhaps did silence) was Richard Barton, the new vicar of Stratford, presented by the Earl of Warwick at Michaelmas 1584. He was 'a preacher of the Word of God' from Coventry, and was highly appreciated. The Stratford corporation paid him a quarter's salary in advance, voted him £4 as a gift, supplemented his 'wages' by £2 per annum (we must multiply these values at least twelve times to get their present equivalent). He stands out as one of the few entirely commended by the authors of the *Survey*—'a preacher, learned, zealous, and godly, and fit for the ministry: a happy age if our Church were

fraught with many such!' He was in Stratford until after the death of the Earl of Leicester in September 1588, and until a few months before the death of the Earl of Warwick in February 1591.

A great change took place in these last years. Mary of Scots was beheaded in 1587, the Armada scattered in 1588, and the fear of Rome vanished almost like a dream. English protestantism had been puritan, the defeat of the Armada was its signal achievement. Anglo-Catholicism (as prelatism) had now a chance. For thirty years Elizabeth had held the country together, trade was flourishing, wealth increasing, her popularity was unbounded. The old Edwardian vanguard was departing: Leicester, Warwick, Walsingham, Huntingdon, Knollys. A sign of weakening in the presbyterian party was the resort to personalities. Warwickshire men, especially Job Throgmorton, of Haseley, a devoted follower of Cartwright, were largely responsible for *Martin Marprelate*, and Leicester's late players, headed by Kemp and including young Shakespeare, joined in the burlesque of 'Martin' and the Bishops on the stage. Whitgift had his revenge, not only on Kemp but on Cartwright and his supporters. Warwick was hardly cold in his grave, beside his brother in the Beauchamp Chapel, before the smarting archbishop turned on his old enemy, master of Leicester's Hospital. With fifteen leading 'brethren' the champion of presbyterianism found himself in the Fleet. All available machinery, legal and illegal (to the wrath of old Sir Francis Knollys and remonstrance of Burghley), was put into motion for the capture of recusants, puritan as well as papist. Alarming, it nevertheless had little effect, owing to sympathy from magistrates and churchwardens responsible for prosecution. In Stratford, as throughout Warwickshire, Protestant and Catholic defaulters (including Master John Shakespeare on the one hand and Squire Clopton on the other) were let down gently by Sir Thomas Lucy and his fellow-commissioners. Far more potent on the Anglican side than Whitgift was Richard Hooker. To Whitgift, indeed, Hooker owed first his appointment at the Temple, and then his withdrawal thence (the Templars wanted the puritan Travers and were angry with Whitgift) into the country, where he found leisure for his *Ecclesiastical Polity*.

This great work, characterised by the largeness, reasonableness, impartiality and historic sense conspicuous in Shakespeare's drama, made a profound impression. It was the one imperishable achievement of Elizabethan Anglicanism, and not the least of the forces which have created twentieth-century Modernism.

Another potent influence quieted the puritans, while it restrained Whitgift. This was the expectation of a presbyterian successor to Elizabeth. Until the eve of his accession James' conversion from the 'purity' of the Scottish Kirk to 'the ill-mumbled mass' of England (to use his own words of 1590) was suspected by few. His deliverance at the Hampton Court Conference was an immense relief to Whitgift and the episcopalians. They triumphed and persecution began afresh. But the King proved a feeble champion of his cause and repulsive to his new subjects in contrast to their late gallant old Queen. She stood out in their grateful recollection as a man in comparison with this cowardly, gabbling, drinking, spendthrift Scot. His own family despised him, and his son, Prince Henry, favoured the Puritans. The youth died, in 1612. Steadily, for the next thirteen years of James' reign, the Church drew apart in hostile factions which were to face each other in civil war.

Shakespeare's work of 1603-1612 is inseparable from the change, the disillusion, the disgust, the danger in the nation. It grows deeply, terribly religious, a picture no longer of humours and gaieties, foibles, graces, errors, delinquencies, but of *sins*, deadly sins, lies and lust, murder and adultery, cruelty, drink, madness, waste. Crosses, 'bare ruined choirs,' friars, even the divine right of princes, lose their spell and potency, become accessories, give way to conscience, retribution, over-ruling and avenging Deity. And interwoven with the wickedness, in contrast with it, heightened by it and throwing it into relief, dark and horrible, is the picture of godly innocence and faithful love, chiefly in girlhood or young wifehood—Isabella, Desdemona, Cordelia, Marina, Perdita, Miranda, loveliest of all, entirely after Shakespeare's heart, Imogen, the perfect Puritan heroine. That the Poet grew grave who can doubt, that he was Prospero at fifty, whatever he was, Prince Hal or Hamlet, at twenty-five. After *A Midsummer Night's Dream* he gives us *The Tempest*. It

is an immense spiritual development. Playthings once of kindly fairies, of Invisible Agencies which plagued us for our good, we are now spirits at war with the flesh, and chastened for our redemption by 'Immortal Providence,' in a world (the great *Globe*) which will 'dissolve,' with the works that are therein (as we read in the *Geneva Version*) in the great 'Day of the Lord,' when we shall rise from long 'sleep' to the Judgment. Let every third thought,' then, be our 'grave'—otherwise, let us number our days, and apply our hearts unto wisdom': 'which,' as we learn from the margin, 'is by considering the shortness of our life and by meditating the Heavenly Joys.'

THE NEED OF A VOLUNTARY CLERGY

By the Rev. H. E. FITZHERBERT, Rector of Latimer with Flaunden,
Bucks.

FOR some twenty years Mr. Roland Allen has been voicing the need for men who, while earning their own living by any legitimate means, are ready to serve the Church as priests without stipend or fee of any kind. Signs are not lacking that at last his suggestions are beginning to receive serious attention.

Those who agree with Mr. Allen are anxious that this scheme should not be considered as a palliative, a hastily contrived remedy to meet the appalling shortage of stipendiary clergy at the present time: but rather that it should be judged as a considered policy to meet the changing needs of a progressive Church. They believe that the Holy Spirit is calling men to fresh effort, and that a great and effectual door is being opened which will lead, by means of a wider conception of the Priesthood, to a revitalized Church life.

The name 'Voluntary Clergy' has been criticized on the ground that (1) all the clergy are 'voluntary,' and that (2) the word 'clergy' is generic and cannot properly be used with the article. At the second objection one need not cavil. As regards the first, it is permissible to point out that we could speak about our 'Volunteer Army' when we did not have conscription in

England, and that 'voluntary' doctors and surgeons are not unknown at hospitals, apart from any suggestion that others in their profession are recruited by means of the press-gang. In any case, the name 'Voluntary Clergy' fulfils the primary condition of nomenclature: it presents accurately and readily the idea which it is intended to convey.

'Voluntary Clergy,' then, are men in full Orders, but not dependent upon that fact for their livelihood. They should fulfil the requirements laid down by Scripture; that is, they should be men of good reputation both in the eyes of their neighbours and in the more intimate relationship of family life. Their qualifications, therefore, are moral and social rather than intellectual. That such a Priesthood can exist in Christendom is shown by a striking article¹ in the current issue of *The Review of the Churches*, in which Canon Lacey gives an account of just such a system in the Orthodox Patriarchate of Antioch.

Can anything of the kind be embodied into the complicated machinery of the Church of England without impairing its efficiency and destroying the delicacy of its balance? Will our people, long used to a trained and stipendiary clergy, be ready to accept the ministrations of a voluntary priest?

The writer would answer both these questions in the affirmative. We may at once make up our minds that there will be opposition. Mr. Prejudice and his forty deaf men will find here a field of adventure much to their liking; and objections, which will be referred to later, will be freely offered.

Let us, however, try to face the situation squarely. The whole position of the parish priest has altered in the last century. To-day much of the work which previously fell to his lot is undertaken by Government officials. Education and relief of the poor are not now duties which he alone is called upon to perform. In bygone days his advice used to be sought in matters of every kind, legal and medicinal, horticultural and matrimonial, to mention but a few of the problems with which he was expected to have a working acquaintance. To-day his advice will seldom be asked on such matters; and if it is—if he is wise he will not attempt the functions of an encyclopaedia,

¹ 'The Patriarchate of Antioch,' by the Rev. Canon Lacey, D.D., in *The Review of the Churches*, April, 1929.

but will refer the enquirer to the appropriate authority. Transit is now cheap and easy. That, with universal education and cheap literature, has altered the whole position.

But at the same time, with advancing knowledge, his work has become more specialized. The training of souls is recognized increasingly, not only as a skilled profession, but as a profession requiring the acquisition of a most exact technique. Let us admit at once that this quality is all too infrequently possessed by the present members of the stipendiary clergy. It would be ample compensation for the fall in numbers of those being ordained if there were any grounds for thinking that their quality was higher than in the past. Unfortunately there is no justification for optimism of that kind.

There is need to face the facts fairly, and to recognise the functions which those who have felt the call to Holy Orders are expected to perform. They are, briefly, the administration of the Sacraments, preaching, and visiting. Of these three, only the first is the peculiar prerogative of the Priesthood. Readers, both diocesan and parochial, are recognized and licensed in the Church of England. Such men, under due licence, are allowed to preach in our churches. And yet preaching is an art: ideally, it requires natural ability and trained experience. A great deal of the visiting in our parishes is already done by laymen and laywomen. Again, to be of real use, special qualities are needed in the visitor.

But the administration of the Sacraments, and particularly of the Holy Communion, is on a different footing. For this the celebrant must be in Priest's Orders. As regards the other essentials, what is requisite is not scholarship, nor intellectual ability, nor training, but singleness of heart and personal sanctity. It cannot be claimed that those already in the Priesthood have the monopoly of these qualities. Has not the time come when this should be recognized, and men sought out who shall be ordained for the administration of the Sacraments, without being expected to relinquish their ordinary avocations?

It is said by some that this step goes too far, and that all which can confidently be expected at the present time is the extension of the permanent diaconate. Supporters of this view say justly that it is not the *celebration* of the Holy Communion,

but its *administration*, that takes the time when there are a large number of communicants. A deacon, or deacons, would overcome this difficulty, and the thorny question of raising to the Priesthood men engaged in other occupations would be avoided. This, while true in itself, only solves the difficulty in town parishes, and even there it does nothing to meet the emergencies caused by the illness of a single-handed priest, or the difficulty of serving daughter churches when a parish is under-staffed.

The great weakness of the present system is, however, most apparent in the country and the mission field. Of the latter the writer has no qualifications to speak, but he would refer his readers to a little book recently published by Mr. Allen, *Voluntary Clergy Overseas*,² in which they will find this aspect of the matter cogently dealt with in all its bearings.

In the country districts the need is urgent. Men endowed with real sympathy and love of the country and its inhabitants are being ordained in less and less numbers, and too frequently a country living in episcopal patronage is looked upon merely as a retiring post for someone who has given his best years in town service, and there is justification for the remark attributed to an old Lincolnshire woman who, when asked what sort of new Vicar the village was expecting, replied, 'Some old "scratter" as no one else wants.'³ Yet it is in the country where energy in the incumbent is most essential, for, whereas in towns there are always energetic secretaries and others to keep the Vicar up to the mark, in the country, unless he himself supplies the initiative, it is unlikely that anything will be done at all.

To-day, because of our Church's diminished man-power, we cannot afford to have a parson in every country parish: if we could afford it, it would not be wise, because, even where there is sufficient income, under modern conditions there is not full-time work in the smaller parishes for a man in the prime of life. This is being recognized, and in every diocese union of benefices is proceeding apace. Because of this too often the lesser

²*Voluntary Clergy Overseas: an Answer to the Fifth World Call.* By the Rev. Roland Allen. Obtainable only from the Author, Amenbury, Beaconsfield; price 1/-.

³Quoted by the Rev. F. A. Iremonger at the Church Congress, Leicester, 1919.

number of services provided is made the excuse for decreasing church attendance, and the celebrations at longer intervals, and possibly at inconvenient times, result in some who had been communicants ceasing to be so. Alternatively, an energetic incumbent will duplicate every Sunday, and on festivals will celebrate three and sometimes four times.

It is to remedy such inconveniences as these that the ordination of voluntary clergymen is required. Such men would understand the conditions of each parish; they would be able to arrange their services at the hours which were most convenient to the bulk of the parishioners; and, if they were only ordained at the request of (or, at least, with the approval of) the Parochial Church Council of the church which they were to serve, it may be assumed that their ministrations would be acceptable.

It must not be thought that they would supersede the incumbent, who, if this scheme were adopted, might well be given the cure of a group of small parishes. On the contrary, his work would be more vital than before, and, because of its greater scope, should attract men of the highest attainments. But he would be freed of much that now militates against the fulfilment of the real duties of his office; his presence would not be expected at every parochial committee, and he would be free to give more time to the preparation of his sermons, reading and prayer. He would know that services were being held regularly in all the churches for which he was responsible; he would know that all serious cases of illness in parishes in which he was not resident would be duly reported to him through a recognized channel; he would not have to preach to the same congregation at least one hundred and four times in the year. He might even, from time to time, be able to take a real holiday (not the busman's holiday of an exchange)—a luxury almost undreamed of by most country parsons of the present time.

Nor is it essential that the 'Voluntary Clergyman' should preach. There are men who, while proud to be deemed worthy to administer the Sacrament, feel no call whatever to the office of preacher, as also there are men who would preach excellently but feel no call to the ministry of the altar. Each could fulfil his vocation under proper licence from his bishop. It might

even be that the possibility of holding Mattins or Evensong without a sermon would be once more established. Something would be accomplished if an average congregation could be persuaded that they met together primarily for prayer and worship, and not to listen to a discourse. The Ministry of the Word is rightly honoured in the Church of England. Its value must not be underestimated. There will always be a place for the sermon. And not only for the sermon of brilliant exposition and intellectual polish. The man with the real love of Christ in his heart, and a message to give; who speaks of the things he knows because 'necessity is laid upon him'; and of whom it may be said 'woe is unto him if he preach not the Gospel,' such will always find an audience, whether he be priest or reader, scholar or artisan. But surely to be condemned to preach to the same congregation twice a day Sunday after Sunday is good neither for preacher nor people. It is this state of things that gave rise to the caustic criticism some years back, 'Surely there is no paid professional work quite so badly done as preaching in the Church of England.'

It only remains to attempt an answer to the various objections which have been urged. It cannot seriously be objected that such a system is contrary to the Catholic usage, as stipendiary clergy were practically unknown in the early Church. The Bishop of Southampton in a recent article⁴ says: 'For the first four centuries there was little distinction made in the social life and conditions of clergy and laity, and certainly no separation of the former from trade or handicraft.' That a distinction was made was perhaps inevitable as time went on. Whether in present circumstances it must be perpetuated is at least open to argument. Some of us view with the profoundest concern any widening of the gulf that is supposed to separate the spiritual from the secular.

Nor need there be any fear that the ordination of an unpaid clergy would lead to lowering the intellectual standard of the stipendiary clergy. The effect would be the exact contrary. The qualifications for the office of 'professional' priest could be made far higher if those in authority were sure that services

⁴ 'Unpaid Clergy: Objections Considered.' The Bishop of Southampton in *The Review of the Churches*, April, 1929.

ould be maintained by voluntary clergymen. The period of apprenticeship (the diaconate is virtually that in our Church to-day) could be lengthened to five, or even seven, years. Thus there would be some assurance that the 'professional,' when he received Priest's Orders, would be qualified, so far as instruction could make him, to teach, to act as spiritual adviser and director, and to conduct a mission. Cases might arise in which a voluntary clergyman would like to enter the ranks of his professional brethren. This should only be allowed after he also had served his apprenticeship. He could not, of course, be anything but a priest, but it would be easy to arrange that he should have no independent cure until this requirement had been fulfilled.

Ridicule is always the argument of weakness, and it seems hardly necessary to discuss at length the objection that the voluntary clergyman would be a 'half-timer,' or the derisive suggestion that he would be 'a clergyman on Sundays and a layman on week-days.' Such remarks betray a forgetfulness of the baptismal commission. Christianity itself is a whole-time job, and, while the clergy, from their prominent position, are naturally expected to live up to a high standard of conduct, there is no different code of morality for them from that which is implicit for all members of the Church. It should be an unqualified advantage that men of this high ideal, reinforced with the power of the Holy Spirit given in ordination, should mingle freely with others in their daily work. If this view is accepted, there will be no need to alter the writing of the English Ordinal, as it has sometimes been suggested would be inevitable if this change were made.

There will be cases where men fail and prove themselves unworthy. There are such cases under the present system. No method can be devised which will eliminate all risks due to the frailty of human nature.

Finally, there is the legal difficulty, which presents some complications. But it seems not unreasonable to argue that Canon Law need not be held as conclusive when circumstances have arisen un contemplated when the law was framed. A Memorandum by Chancellor P. V. Smith, on the legal aspect of the extension of the diaconate, supports this view. He quotes

the Pluralities Act of 1838 as prohibiting, with certain exceptions, farming or trading on the part of persons licensed or allowed to perform the duties of any ecclesiastical office, and continues :

‘The Act applies equally to persons in any of the three Orders of the Ministry. But it clearly does not extend to those who are not actually at the time exercising any ecclesiastical function, and *it does not appear to extend to either Priests or Deacons who may be serving the Church gratuitously in no actual definite Office, since its penalties could not be put in force against them.*’

Most people will attach great weight to this authority.

To sum up, the case for the ordination of ‘Voluntary Clergy’ is that the change is simple and in direct accordance with the teaching of Scripture. Incidentally, it is an indirect evolutionary solution to the present problem of shortage of clergy. If it were introduced, its influence on the Church would not be felt fully for many years to come. It is not suggested that the bishops should say, in effect, ‘Here is a splendid idea! Let us ordain at once a couple of thousand of voluntary priests.’ Rather the change would be very gradual, while the utmost care was exercised in choosing men fitted for the great responsibility of their task. But they would be found, here one and there another, until what was begun as an experiment became the recognized practice of the Church. Is it a dream to look forward to a time when each member of the Church shall have opportunity of finding therein his true vocation? Some will be called to the service of the altar, and some to the ministry of the Word : some will be able to give that service freely, while some, set apart for the special study of the Word and the care of the flock, will be maintained by the Church. Whether they be voluntary or stipendiary would appear to be of little importance, so long as they are all helping to make the Church in a true sense the family of God, and the Sacrament the centre of her life and worship. Thus will her priests be in fact ‘not lords over God’s heritage, but ensamples to the flock.’

THOUGHTS ON THE CHURCH

By the REV. J. C. HARDWICK, M.A., B.Sc.

IV.—THE PAROCHIAL MILL.

IT is often said that the Church of England fails through not being up to date, and through not being 'in touch with life.' A number of clergy, believing this to be true, hope to put things right by indulging in what are called modern methods. Such methods are not uncommon in America where a good deal of ingenuity has been expended upon them. In a country where business instinct is active and religion moribund, Church life is associated with all the most up-to-date adjuncts. 'Spot-lights,' for example, are called in to impress a public whose Hollywood mentality is impervious to a religious appeal. Soloists, bands, sensational and well-advertised subjects for addresses; all such machinery is well understood and ably utilised. There is also a good deal of social life and even philanthropic effort, often of an entirely harmless character. In England as yet our achievements in this direction have been less spectacular. We have gone in for Socialism, masculine Christianity, hearty services, advanced ritual, or what not, with more or less divided minds, wondering doubtfully whether we were not making fools of ourselves. Still, even here, there is a distinct forward movement. Cathedrals, for example, are in certain cases being fitted up like dolls' houses. A picture of an angel holding an aeroplane gives the startling air of modernity to a cathedral; and reminds one of what probably awaits the building in the next war.

Yet little in the way of religious revival can be hoped from even the most up-to-date stage properties. These will not bring a church which has lost touch with life into contact with it again, since life is not a matter of frillings. What is needed for new life is not so much new modes and new machinery as new ideas. Yet even the word 'idea' has been so mishandled that for some it is equivalent to a stunt, an indication of our state of intellectual and spiritual bankruptcy. If a church has lost touch with life its message will not become more effective

by being sent over the wireless, nor its worship more sincere by introducing into the Litany a suffrage on behalf of those who travel by air as well as by land or by water. Indeed, the only point in writing a new prayer is that you should have a new need to utter, which you believe the utterance will relieve. People conscious of no religious needs or aspirations will be attracted neither by our 'incomparable liturgy,' nor by new prayers drawn up in a hurry by bishops' secretaries devoid of literary taste. The plain fact is that if the present age is alienated from religion, it will not be brought back to religion by methods of this sort. A frivolous policy of modernising external detail only strikes the public as an evasion of the issue and a sham.

An alternative and equally ineffective method of attracting a non-religious public to church is the device of associating religion with a number of things for which there is thought to be a demand, but with which in reality it has very little to do. This policy has involved churches in the responsibility of supplying healthy amusements for the proletariat, and various forms of sociability for the middle classes. Altogether apart from the burdens thus laid upon the clergy, who have been expected to regard themselves as inexhaustible sources of entertainment, and of social amenity in general, the policy is clearly doomed to failure. It may have been successful, even if a trifle ridiculous, in the past, but the trouble now is that the demand for such things as we can supply in this line is rapidly diminishing. The amusements provided by the church for a now sophisticated public seem *un peu fadés*. The distracted incumbent of an industrial parish knows too well that he cannot rival the cinema, the dance hall, the billiard hall, the dog- or dirt-track, the working men's club, the domestic loud-speaker, the cheap motor bicycle. The populace now enjoys ample means of inexpensive diversion without the skeleton at the feast in the shape of a vicar or curate. Nor do the working classes any longer need our philanthropy, meagre as it must necessarily be compared with what is paid for out of the rates. The day of penny banks, sick clubs, holiday funds, blanket clubs, coal and grocery tickets, at least as far as these are dependent upon the church, is passing or gone. It is not only that an able mechanic can earn as much as, or more than a curate, but what with unem-

ployment insurance, sick clubs, friendly societies and so on (run free from all church control) he has little need of our help, even if we had any to offer.

So much for the proletariat. With regard to the middle class, the Church has hitherto attracted them not by amusements or philanthropy, but by a certain social prestige with which the clergy found themselves invested. But now there have opened up other avenues to the socially ambitious besides that of going to church. To possess a good tennis lawn and to use it industriously at week-ends is a surer means of social advancement than to become a churchwarden. The young middle class *belle* does not nowadays think it worth while to become a Sunday school teacher in order to marry the curate. The fact is that church membership in these days involves one in little else but perpetual demands for money. Moreover, if one has a car, one has no time to go to church. If it is fine, one has to go out in it, while if it is wet one has to stay in to oil and grease it.

The policy of offering stunts and amusements, then, would appear to be failing. The stunts make people disgusted, and the amusements make them tired. The method of attracting a non-religious public by non-religious lures no longer works. Our bait is inferior, or judged so by those who are asked to take it, the only people whose taste need be considered. The Church, as it would appear, is being offered the alternatives of falling back on its own proper business or of going into liquidation. It is only too true that the commodity which we have to supply, religion, is one for which there is only an infinitesimal demand. Yet the demand for an article is not to be stimulated by offering something quite different. If our article is a good one the demand for it may revive if we continue to offer it and not something else. Signs are not completely wanting that a demand for religion, tentative and uncertain, is beginning to arise. But the Church, engrossed in finance, bureaucratic machinery, stunts of all sorts, and the provision of healthy entertainment, displays too few signs of being in a position to meet the demand. Our preoccupations are a grave handicap.

To jettison nine-tenths of our present activity and to concentrate upon religion would be a tremendous relief to the parochial clergy, and would give most of them a new lease of life.

At present their energies are absorbed to an incredible extent in an exhausting round of futilities. Whist-drives and dances, tea-parties, clubs for adolescents, for adults, for old people; treats, outings, committees, district-visitors' meetings, guilds, heaven knows what. The clergy are always in a hurry, and how can hurry co-exist with religion? The vapid round of their activity is perpetual, and they accomplish—nothing! The greater part of the business to which we are tied is, from the religious standpoint, pure waste of time. It should not be forgotten that activity may be the surest indication of spiritual poverty and intellectual bankruptcy. Work is an opiate of thought just as much as pleasure is, and is as morally indefensible unless it serves some useful purpose. As for indulgence in stunts, they are only a form of histrionics and self-display, or (what is worse) self-deception. The stunt-purveyor thinks he is delivering the goods, and persuades other people to the same effect, but he is only covering everything with a layer of deception. This sort of ecclesiastical buffoonery ought to be discontinued.

Furthermore, behind this general entertainment business and sensation mongering, and largely caused thereby, is the thing that wears the clergy out, body and soul—the perpetual hunt for money. The harrassed parish clergyman must find cash for Church societies, for diocesan and central church machinery, for parochial organisations, for current church expenses. All parishes are perpetually hard up; and most of them live on overdrafts at the bank. Yet the clergy are not permitted to cut down expenses or recognise the fact that it is the non-religious activities which cost the money. The trouble is that when a thing has been started it has to be kept going at any cost. Many parishes are saddled with an expensive plant, the legacy perhaps of days when conventional religion was a paying concern. An energetic, businesslike, enthusiastic, self-advertising incumbent boosts a parish, raises money, builds up organizations, erects expensive buildings, receives the promotion which has been the motive of his labours, and leaves, as a memorial to his successor, an imposing fabric, debts, and the embers of a conflagration.

The abandonment of the present stunt and entertainment policy would certainly relieve the parochial clergy of a heavy

burden of worry and anxiety. Nevertheless its adoption would call for a certain degree of courage. It is no easy matter to abandon methods sanctified by time and (formerly) by success, and also by the approval of the authorities. Bishops, for example, like a parochial clergyman to make a good show; and he will stand small chance of promotion who does not display a business-like ability to attract people to his church. 'Get the people, honestly if you can, but get them' is the sort of advice that his ecclesiastical superiors may be expected to give to a young incumbent. And few men can resist the temptation to become successful. But the way of the popular clergyman, like that of the transgressor, is hard. He is run off his feet; and the more he gives, the more people expect. It is a terrible thing to have the reputation of being successful and popular; to be a favourite is to be a slave, and also, in nine cases out of ten, a scaphant.

Those, however, who are brave enough to estimate episcopal approval and public adulation at their right value will not hesitate to sacrifice either or both for the sake of what is better worth having, peace of mind and the consciousness of doing something useful. But will not the present meagre attendances at church become still more meagre? It remains to be seen. It may be that if the clergy confined themselves to their own proper work instead of frittering away their energies on a multitude of business as they do, their ministrations would improve in quality and become more helpful. A tired man cannot do his work well, and a worried man will always do it badly. Without necessarily believing much in sermons, we may nevertheless admit that a good sermon is more useful than a bad one; and a weary, harrassed man's sermon is more likely to be bad than good. On the whole we may expect that if the clergy occupy themselves rather more exclusively with religion, those parishioners who are religiously inclined will come to church, and those otherwise inclined will stay away, which is about the best thing they can do under the circumstances. After all, though there has been a great deal of discussion as to the reasons why people do not come to church, only one satisfactory explanation has hitherto been given, and that is that they do not want to. The only people nowadays who come, or are likely to come,

to church with any regularity are those who are religious. These will come to church altogether apart from amusements or stunts. They may enjoy such things, but their taste for them (if they have any) will be something altogether apart from their taste for religion. Religion they will have, just as a drunkard will have his dram or the lover his mistress, or the hungry man his food. They will sacrifice anything to get it, and if it is not brought to them, they will go and fetch it. Such is the attitude of the religious man towards his religion; he does not need to be persuaded or bribed to go near it; he has to be persuaded or bribed or forcibly compelled to keep away. If people come to church because the parson is a decent fellow and jolly at a dance, they will only come occasionally and because they have nothing else better to do. Such people are more trouble than they are worth; or rather, no amount of trouble will make them worth anything.

It should be clearly understood, however, what is meant by saying that the clergy should confine their attention to religion. The usual interpretation is that they should reduplicate services. But there are already far too many services; what is needed is not more but fewer, and these of better quality. This does not mean that the clergy should not pray; but the prayer-wheel does not mean prayer. Only a minority of clergy at present have time to pray. As for meditation and quiet thought, that food and medicine of the soul, few clergy, rushed as they are with clubs and treats and dances and committees and bazaars, have any time or energy for these things at all. The average stockbroker has more chances of cultivating the religious life than the parish clergyman has as things are at present.

What the clergy need, if they are to be spiritually effective, is to be allowed to possess their souls, and to be absolved from the rush and scramble, and (what is far more soul-destroying) the unreality, of parochial religious life. (We use the term 'religious' in a purely conventional sense). The clergy should, in short, be allowed to *think*. Most of us have forgotten how; we get so little opportunity. The customary 'quiet day' or retreat as at present in vogue is no real equivalent, though doubtless valuable. On these occasions, our thinking is done for us by someone else; and even at times (such is the state to which we are reduced) a man pulls out his notebook and jots down a point

or two, or an apt illustration, which may come in for a sermon. But this is not thinking, it is only letting another man's thoughts occupy our minds.

The presentation of religion to an age like the present almost devoid of the taste for religion is a task of the utmost difficulty, and will not be successfully performed by people whose own religious life is dwarfed and stunted by a multitude of irrelevant claims on their time and energy. Nor will it be done by men whose minds are too occupied to think or to learn. It will only be done by men for whom religion is a primary interest and preoccupation, and who have some degree of freedom to devote themselves wholly to it.

CHRISTIANITY SPIRITUAL BUT NON-MIRACULOUS¹

By the Rev. R. D. RICHARDSON, M.A., B.Litt., author of *The Present Conflict of Ideals in the English Church*.

RELIGION implies a craving and its satisfaction: the character of the religion is determined by the kind of craving which it satisfies. Man's first cravings are for food, for sleep, for victory, for children; cravings which experience soon teaches are either gratified or thwarted by the objects and forces of the visible world around. To these therefore he attributes a spirit like his own, similarly claimful, similarly arbitrary. Religion is everywhere: miracle is everywhere: both are one, and material.

It was a great step forward when men first realized that physical satisfactions are not adequate; when the world within stirred restlessly out to a world beyond, and the Gods of that world became the Gods of man's spirit. If life for us is often tired and troubled, what must it have been at the close of the Neolithic age, when wave succeeding wave of peoples was dashed and dispersed upon the shores of history. Then, indeed, men began to look upward to the heavens, and in the ordered circling

¹ A paper read to the Birmingham Society of Modernist Churchmen.

of the moon and stars found a peace which seemed to speak to them of Home. You remember Virgil's picture in the *Aeneid*, transcribed so well by Dr. Glover; the picture of war and bloodshed, and then the burning of the dead; the solemn ritual, and the torch set to the pyres, while those bereaved sit by and watch, till 'dewy night wheels round the sky all set with blazing stars.' 'It is a stern picture,' notes the commentator, 'that Virgil draws, of the passionless stars in the great heaven, moving on in their beauty and wonder, irrespective of human hearts that break.' The contrast is so true, and awful; and reveals so well that lack of harmony in man's nature which brought two worlds instead of one into existence. From henceforth until now we have a natural and a supernatural, and the problem of their relation to each other becomes paramount.

It is a moral problem first of all. There is a want to be satisfied deeper than man's primary wants, deeper even than his want of love and comradeship: there is a want for justice. Among the Greeks it found expression in Euripides: among the Jews in the writer of the Book of Job. But both these leave the problem in its ultimate form unsolved: man can only bow the head to God, who cuts the knot by miracle. Sickness, disaster, and untimely death are His judgments; interventions from on high, according to His private reading of men's hearts. Conversely, holy men gave credentials of their sanctity, as when for Elijah's sake the barrel of meal and cruise of oil did not fail, and when Elisha, because he was a man of God, brought the Shunammite's child to life again. The desire to see things so assisted greatly its fulfilment, in a world which knew no reason why they should not be. Nevertheless, we have here a very definite movement in the evolution of religion. Although miracle is still in its expression material, it has now, in its underlying cause, been ethicized.

And secondly, there arises at this stage a spiritual problem and a spiritual want. The soul craves peace, a stillness and serenity like that which seems manifested in the stars.

'Bright star, would I were steadfast as thou art!'

exclaimed Keats, in a line which shows how men recapitulate in the development of their own spirit the spiritual history of the

race. And Byron, rapt by a feeling-tone of cleansing and security as he contemplates the host of heaven, thinks it is

‘to be forgiven,
That in our aspirations to be great,
Our destinies o’erleap their mortal state,
And claim a kindred with you.’

The essential point is the soul’s awakening to its fetters : more ; in the last resort, its refusal to be overcome. Still far from understanding that the smallest act of love is of itself worth the whole physical universe, it tries to rise above the indifference of nature and adverse circumstance by linking itself to the *fascinans, mysterium, tremendum*. Thus a spiritual religion is not unlikely to be at first an astral religion, a system of magical concordats.

We next ascend to the level of Christian experience, already so far developed by the time of St. Augustine as to necessitate a view of the supernatural different from the Chaldean. Augustine expresses repeatedly his conviction that Heaven is not a place. ‘Thou wast never a place, and yet we have receded from Thee : and we have drawn nearer to Thee, yet Thou art never a place.’ In other words, a supernatural has now been discovered at work *within* the natural. The welding together of these two levels, the presentation of the supernatural as supremely personal, a world of Grace encompassing all about and penetrating the world of Nature, was the great work of St. Thomas Aquinas. The natural was regarded by him not as primarily sinful, but as weak, requiring constantly to be upheld lest it should cease to be. This conception seems to me wholly satisfactory, but I doubt if St. Thomas himself held it consistently, as, for example, when he defines miracle as something which breaks, instead of strengthens, the natural order. The fact is that the evidence of natural science was required to make so sublime a gospel fully credible. To realize that a creative force still operates within the universe, and that the creative process is therefore still proceeding, renders it impossible to believe that the natural is ever *contradicted* by the spiritual.

Such, however, has not been the view of Catholicism as a whole. Not merely is God held to interpose directly in the natural order, and His power to perform miracles thought to be

mediated to the Saints, but the inmost states of the soul itself are generally conceived of as miraculous, the result of a bedewing from the supernatural which can even confer freedom from man's natural restricted liberty of choice. This was upheld for instance by Bossuet in his famous controversy with Fénelon.

But under pressure of an enlarging view of nature there has been of late developed the conception of miracle not as contrary to nature but above it. Even the inmost states of the soul have now been invaded by science, and law found to reign in the associations of memory, in flights of imagination, in the developments of conscience, and in spiritual endeavour, as much as in the lower orders of biology and chemistry. The sphere of miracle has thus suffered some contraction, being regarded as operative only in congruity with Divine condescensions like the Incarnation; operative, too, only through the emergency action of laws higher than those which generally function.

The concession has been comparatively easy for those—especially in the Church of England—who hold the ordinary Catholic view of a world of supernature running parallel with and immediately contingent on a world of nature, but it can only be regarded as a makeshift. On these lines nothing can prevent nature from eventually swallowing supernature. When the existence of an ascending scale of laws is once acknowledged, these do not admit of being considered interchangeable. To suppose, for example, that spiritual laws can ever function in chemical compounds is nonsense.

But the reverse is also true. It is likewise nonsense to suppose that spiritual experience can be adequately explained by chemistry. Our ideal natures cannot seriously be regarded as by-products of a purely physical organism. While then we feel compelled to abandon the old distinction between natural and supernatural, we will interpret the natural in the light of the best that it includes, in the light of Goodness, Fairness, Courage, Truth, Self-sacrifice, and Love. For us, to-day, these values represent the truth about the universe. They are fully natural as occurring in the normal world of nature to which we belong, all else in which is to be valued in the degree that it reflects them. The world is not dead or even indifferent to

spiritual achievement, but in its heights and depths there dwells a Power Who co-operates with us to secure the ultimate victory of the highest that we know. The God of this world is also the God of my spirit.

What now becomes of miracle? If the natural is spiritual to the core, if the more spiritual a thing is the more natural it also is, then the less need will it have of miraculous credentials. Even supposing that a miracle is possible, and well attested in history, what can it prove but itself? The appeal to miracle is in fact nothing less than a setting aside of conscience and spiritual experience. It is an encouragement to spiritual backwardness in a world whose spiritual nature may be directly perceived by awakened souls. Such insight, such flying straight of the soul to the Value, the Divinely Personalistic Reality in the universe is the essence of religion, and so long as this is recognised religion is impregnable. Miracle, therefore, we will set aside, as for our purposes irrelevant.

But, it may be objected, if you are trying to prove the Divine Personal Reality at the heart of the universe, miracle is essential as demonstrating the freedom essential to personality. That is not so. Anything like unaccountability disappears as we ascend in the scale of being. Unity and consistency are the hall-marks of personality. Liberty of choice implies disunity and inconsistency, as we see in our own condition, where daily, hourly, choices are presented to us. There are no such choices for God. Freedom for Him consists in inability to deviate from His perfectly spiritual nature. Miracle, instead of proving His freedom, would be a grave imperfection. On this ground also we will rule it out.

It is illuminating at this point to take a great soul like the late Baron von Hügel (who though he makes it clear that religion is not based on miracles, nowhere expressly repudiates them) and see what use he makes of them. He treats them symbolically, as significant of some spiritual truth. Thus they stand for

(a) The appearance of new factors in the world. An example would be the Virgin Birth, which symbolises the truth that Jesus was unique.

(b) The superiority of spirit over matter. Obvious examples are the Stilling of the Storm and the Feeding of the Five Thousand.

(c) The apparently direct action of God's spirit on the soul. An example would be the descent of the Holy Dove on Jesus at His Baptism.

These examples, with the exception of the first, are not actually given I think by the Baron,² but they follow from his few discreet general references to miracle.² Actual miracles however are surely unnecessary thus to symbolize what we believe without them. The actuality of those alleged may therefore without loss be relegated to the sphere of literary and historical criticism. Let us indeed, if the value of miracles is for us to become primarily symbolical, embark deliberately on poetry and mythology. The miracles of the Fourth Gospel, for example, are for this purpose much to be preferred to those of the Synoptists.

II

We have now traced in outline the history of miracle in its relation to religion. Miracle was once the essence of religion. Then it became the vindication of religion. It is now a dead weight on religion, and prevents men from seeing that Christianity is all of a piece with the universe. Let us consider in conclusion some of the excellencies of a religion which is spiritual but not miraculous.

(1) A spiritual religion is also a rational and a moral religion. A miraculous religion is a challenge to both reason and conscience. On the one hand it asserts that what is impossible nevertheless happens; on the other, it ties Christianity to alleged events like the destruction of the swine and the blasting of the fig-tree. The complete scepticism thus perilously engendered is overcome only by the command of an external authority.

² This observation is not meant to be offensive. The writer owes too much to von Hügel, as this essay will reveal, to feel anything but sympathy with his effort to be truthful. He himself remarks, rather pathetically, that Truthfulness is the most difficult of all virtues for an Institutionalists. Those who are not so environed or constituted that they must be Roman Catholics may, therefore, be (temperately) glad.

(2) The spiritual implies, and furnishes throughout, grounds for belief in Immortality. It begins with God, or, if you like, with Goodness, Truth and Beauty. These divine qualities we do not make, but in proportion as we come to share them we believe that they confer upon us something of their own imperishableness. Miracle has nothing to say in this supremely important sphere: the most it can do is to establish survival after death.

(3) In the presence of the spiritual the soul aches and suffers, and this leads us into more delicate insights, discriminations, and sympathies. The miraculous only blinds and bewilders.

(4) Miracle is never thirsted for by any deeply religious soul. The saint, even when he believes in miracles, leaves them aside as inadequate. Heroism, humility, purity, unlimited compassion, and self-forgetfulness—these spiritual qualities—are what he longs for. Even the scientist, *qua* scientist, may be regarded on this view as a religious person: he thirsts for what more of truth there is to find, whether behind germs or papyri. But miracle is alien to all this: in cutting short the hope of a knowledge of the Truth, which would necessarily be undiscoverable in a world of mysterious interventions, it hinders the sanctification of the whole of life.

(5) The spiritual points to ultimate, personalistic values like Goodness, Truth, and Beauty, akin to our own inmost nature, at the heart of the world in which we live. It awakens in us the sense of incompleteness and presents a view of the creative process as still proceeding. We see, in William Law's fine phrase, that 'the whole of our redemption is only nature set right.' Miracle, on the contrary, is final; isolated; proves nothing of itself. If it is true, it implies that God is present on a lower than the spiritual plane, that is, in a capacity less than fully personal. Thus

(6) The spiritual, as contrasted with the miraculous, leads us on to a right understanding of the meaning of progressive revelation. Revelation is God's gift of *Himself*, in and through persons. It does not stand isolated in a crowd of uniformitarian experience, like miracle in the natural order. All its expres-

sions link together, culminating finally in the revelation in the character of Jesus.³ Thus we get a solid background of Personality to the universe; in the words of *Ugo Bassi*,

‘A central Heart,
An everlasting, everquickening Vine.
And you and I, my brethren, live and grow,
Branches of that immortal, human stem.’

Miracle, on the other hand—revelation through things—is disconnected, and ultimately destructive of all this. At best it leads only to a Deistic conception of the universe.

To conclude. It is for this spiritual but non-miraculous presentation of Christianity that English Modernism stands. What truth or value there is in the contention that the root error of Modernism is the pre-supposition that miracles cannot happen may now be judged. The real truth is that none can be a Modernist, save in a superficial and destructive sense, unless he has attained considerable religious experience and inner development. But to substitute for this a religion of authority with miraculous *credenda* is equally superficial and spells indeed an ineffective and discredited Christianity. In Eucken’s phrase, ‘A new world is dawning . . . the world of the spiritual life,’ of the natural fully transfigured. That to us comes the opportunity of helping to usher it in, is perhaps the only ground we have for belief in miracles.

³ F. J. A. Hort, in his notes to *The Way, The Truth, The Life*, was, perhaps, the first to detect this. His insight here, as elsewhere, was truly prophetic, but he fails to draw the inevitable conclusions with regard to miracle.

MISSIONARY METHODS AND OBJECTS

By the Ven. Archdeacon BERESFORD POTTER.

THE *Hibbert Journal* of April, 1929, has an interesting article by Claude G. Montefiore, on 'The Attempted Conversion of the Jews.' It complains of many things in Christian Missions: 'the long-drawn-out attempts of Christians to induce them, the Jews, to abandon their ancestral faith.'

'What the ordinary educated English Jew,' he says, 'thinks about these attempts is hardly known in the Christian world.' 'There always have been conversionary efforts; there always will be. There always has been a heap of money thus wasted. A few Jews, mostly among the illiterate and the poor, succumb to the arguments of the missionaries. The vast majority, even as their ancestors successfully resisted dire persecutions, resist successfully such persistent efforts.'

He goes on to say that:

'The common Jewish view of Christianity is that it teaches that only those that believe its own specific dogmas can be saved. Not works, but faith, is the test; and faith the Jew supposes to mean a belief in the specific doctrines of the Christian religion. No wonder, then, that the Christian, with this false conception of his, desires to convert Jew and heathen alike, and to save them from an eternity of Hell.'

The writer admits that 'to try to convert the heathen to Christianity is justifiable.' But he reminds his readers that 'the Jews are the inheritors and possessors of a great religion, with a noble literature of its own'; and adds that their 'ideals of morality are as pure and as lofty as those of Christianity itself.' The writer concludes with the words:

'Christianity sprang from Jewish parentage. Their religious and ethical ideas are in close accordance. Jew and Christian conceive God as one; to both He is righteous, to both He is loving, to both He is near, to both He is our Father, to whom men can pray, with whom they may commune. Let there be respect and recognition. At the last it may be that the truth (not perhaps either quite the Judaism or the Christianity of to-day) will triumph and prevail.'

Might it not be useful if Christian missionaries were to bear some facts in mind: (1) That our Lord was a Jew, and remained so to the end of His life. (2) That there is no evidence that His missionary work, and that of His first disciples, aimed at making converts to Christianity, because that religion had not been

definitely framed, and named, until after His death on the cross. (3) That His main work consisted in three things : (a) the healing of the sick and troubled in heart, (b) the presentation to the world of a true view of the nature of His Father in heaven and of the kind of life which He desired His children to lead, (c) that wherever there was the resolve to lead this life, the power to do so would be given by the Spirit of the Eternal. Converts may exist without any real conformity to this teaching. But men and women may be led to believe it, and act on it, without being always external converts. A young missionary wrote to me the other day :

‘I feel sure that the missionary method which you advocate is the only one to appeal to educated non-Christians : and it is good that many missionaries now do not reckon their success by statistics, but look for a less easily defined, but deeper, leavening.’

BOOK REVIEWS

MATERIALISM AND RELIGION*

This pamphlet of Mr. Needham's is as good a shilling's worth as we have seen for some time. The author is a Cambridge biochemist who, like ninety per cent. of working biological investigators, is a mechanist, i.e., one who believes that the organism can be interpreted, for scientific purposes, completely in terms of chemistry and physics. That is to say, he is against every form of vitalism, whether thorough-going, like that of Driesch, or methodological and diluted, like that of Haldane and Thomson.

Mr. Needham has no sympathy with those well-intentioned persons who ‘compound remarkable mixtures of scientific and religious thought, bottling them under such labels as “The Religion of Science,”’ and he holds that ‘demonstrations by well-meaning philosophers of the part played by faith and intuition in scientific research only add to the confusion.’ He believes that materialism and its mechanical view are the life-blood of scientific thought. ‘It is much better to realise that the scientific view of the world is inwardly analytical, mathematical and materialistic . . . Mechanism and materialism lie at the basis of scientific thought.’

This sounds, and is, uncompromising ; yet it is not to be supposed that Mr. Needham's outlook is equivalent to that ‘scientific naturalism’ which played such a large part in the controversies of the last century, which was supported by Huxley, Tyndall and Spencer, and which was so vigorously attacked by Ward in his *Naturalism and Agnosticism*.

Where moderns like Needham, Eddington and Whitehead, differ from the Victorian giants above mentioned is that they have studied more closely the nature of the scientific method. They realise (1) that science is *essentially* analytical, mathematical and mechanical, and (2) ‘that scientific method possesses a remarkably strong subjective element, or, in other words, that the world as seen by science is not the world as it really is.’

* *Materialism and Religion*. By Joseph Needham. (Ernest Benn, Ltd. 1/-.)

In science, mathematics, mechanism and materialism, are the instruments by which the world is measured and the medium through which it is seen.

The change that has taken place in our attitude to science since the last century has in fact been considerable. 'Formerly it was believed that the scientific view of the world was, as it were, dictated to the man of science by an infallible guide; he had only to make his experiments, and inch by inch the Veil of Isis would rise like a safety curtain at a play. The concept of absolute revelation, in fact, had been transferred bodily from religion to science.'

But the change in our attitude to religion has been no less extensive. The important point is that the religious experience is no more and no less directly in touch with the real than scientific experience; it is only another way of expressing our faculties.' Both the religious and the scientific views of the world are 'shot through and through with the subjective element,' and neither sees the world as it really is. But 'the subjectivity, the humanness, the lack of finality of religion, is of just the same order as that of science.' If religion is the effect in us of something more than us, then so is science; if religion is solely a product of our own spiritual activity, then science also is such a product.

Absolute revelation is no more tenable a theory in religion than it is in science, for in religion, as in science, we have the human spirit striving, under limitations, to gain contact with reality.

'Organised religion must give up the certainty that it possesses the last word in religious truth and everything that is necessary to salvation. It will find it best to admit that discoveries in the numinous world may be made in a quite analogous way with those in the scientific world, and that there is then no fundamental difference between Francis of Assisi and Napier of Merchistoun, between Ignatius Loyola and Andreas Vesalius. There is a progress, an unfolding, an enrichment in religion just as there is in science, and to maintain that it is now over and that it ends with us is an absurd mixture of pride and pessimism.'

And Mr. Needham quotes J. E. Flecker's lines :

*'Awake, awake! The world is young,
For all its weary years of thought:
The strongest fights must yet be fought,
The most surprising songs be sung.'*

Such is the belief of the modern world: truth lies not in the past but in the future—there lies the cleavage between that world and the churches to-day. It does not seem that anything can reconcile such a divergence. 'Between us and you there is a great gulf fixed; so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot; neither can they pass to us, that would come from thence.' Which of the two is right? Time will show, but it is very difficult to believe that the poet's verse is not prophetic. J.C.H.

THE PASSION FOR LIFE.*

In 1920, the Rev. John Lewis published a book, *The Vital and Social Factors in Religious Belief*, which revealed wide reading and presented new points of view. The author showed himself fully alive to the importance of studying the work done by anthropologists on human origins, and of applying the results to the problem of the history of civilization. More recently, he has devoted himself to special research in anthropology and comparative religion; and now in a new volume he has sought to show

* *The Passion for Life*. By John Lewis, M.A., Ph.D., Yale University Press. (Humphrey Milford. Oxford University Press, 1928.)

that the primary motive of religion is 'the passion for life,' or the strong urge to 'have life and have it more abundantly.' The germ of the thing is found in the vital impulse of lower organisms. Man himself, when he becomes religious, thinks of his deities or of the Deity as essentially life-givers. In the earlier stages it was natural to think of the life-giver as feminine, that is to say, as the Mother-goddess. At later stages the Mother-goddess was given a son or a consort, or certain female deities were changed into gods.

Dr. Lewis shows a thorough appreciation of Sumerian, Babylonian and Egyptian literatures. In spite of having been brought up on the Old Testament, he writes about them with a candour which is as refreshing as it is rare. Students of the Old Testament are usually too grudging in their praise of ancient literatures which are not Hebraic. However noble it may be, some flaw, they seem to think, must be found in it. Dr. Lewis says of a passage in one of Ikhnaton's hymns, 'nothing is loftier than that in the Old Testament; nothing is nobler than that in the Hebrew Psalms.'

Dr. Lewis's books are truly stimulating and suggestive. One only wonders whether, in his latest work, he has found the happiest expression for that vital urge or energy which he finds throughout life. Passion is a strong term. It may suit the earlier stages of religion. It hardly seems appropriate for the later stages. In any case, the expression jars. The feeling after life and more life, which becomes also the feeling after new life, is insistent and persistent. Can it be called passionate?

MAURICE A. CANNEY.

THE EXCAVATIONS AT UR.

Mr. C. Leonard Woolley, whose excavations at Ur during the last three or four years have been reported from time to time in the newspapers, has now produced in a very interesting book a more detailed account of the civilization of the Sumerians.¹ Here the reader will find in the form of a connected story all that has been discovered so far about Sumer and Akkad in the earliest times, about the Royal Graves at Ur, about early Sumerian art, about the social life and about religious beliefs. Certainly the work of excavation, which is still in progress, and about which some reports have appeared already in the newspapers, will add to our knowledge. But in the meantime Mr. Woolley's book will be read with appreciation and gratitude.

Akkad, in the north of Babylonia, at an early date was occupied for the most part by Semites. Sumer, in the south, was occupied mainly by the Sumerians. It was they who gave the district its name, and imposed upon it their language and civilization. They were not Semites, and it is not known whence they came. Since their gods are represented constantly as standing upon mountains, and their temple, the *ziggurat* or staged tower, gives the impression of an artificial mountain, it has been inferred that the Sumerians were by origin a hill-folk. But such an inference is very hazardous. Wherever they came from, they seem to have known of a time when man was quite devoid of culture. One of their hymns says: 'Mankind, when created, did not know of bread for eating or garments for wearing. The people walked with limbs on the ground, they ate herbs with their mouths like sheep, they drank ditch-water.'

According to the scribes, writing about 2,000 B.C., there were Sumerian cities and kings before the Flood. The Flood is mentioned in the King-lists as the dividing line between two long periods. The description of the

* *The Sumerians*. By C. Leonard Woolley. (Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1928. 6/- net.)

Flood is found in the well-known Deluge Epic, of which the Babylonian Flood-legend and the Biblical Flood-story are variants. Since his book was written, Mr. Woolley has stated in a newspaper article that he has now found in a deep deposit of clean mud definite geological evidence of a great flood which made a landmark in history. But other explanations of the deposit are possible. In any case, Sumerian tradition is so far from implying the total, or almost total, destruction of the human race that it does not even imply the total destruction of the inhabitants of the delta. But, flood or no flood, according to Woolley, Sumerian civilization was fully developed in the fourth millennium B.C.

The main results of the excavations are more or less well known, and it would take too much space to enumerate them here. It is more important to consider Mr. Woolley's attitude towards the vexed question of the origin of civilization. He tells us that in 3,500 B.C. Sumerian art stood at a level seldom reached in the ancient world and, clinging to the old idea of evolution, asserts that it must have had behind it centuries of growth and experience. He claims that the Sumerians had a very thorough understanding of metal, and that the socketed axes, which are normal in the graves, are far in advance of anything produced by Egyptian smiths. For the unification of the two prehistoric kingdoms of Egypt under 'Menes,' he accepts the date c. 3,300 B.C. Then he contends that 'in the time of "Menes" not only was the cultural level of Mesopotamia far higher than that of Egypt, but whereas the civilization of Egypt was a novelty, that of Sumer was ancient: Sumerian civilization, whatever its ultimate origin, had developed in its own country and on its own lines for so long that it could fairly by now be called endemic, while that of Egypt was inspired and made possible by the introduction of foreign models and foreign blood.' The Sumerians, we are asked to believe, were the forerunners of all the Old World civilizations of Egypt, Asia Minor, Crete and Greece.

Mr. Woolley's chronology for Sumerian civilization needs to be received with caution. He is clearly under the temptation to push back the dates as far as possible, and his chronology is not accepted by all archaeologists. V. Gordon Childe, in his recently published book, *The Most Ancient East* (1928), gives as the date of the First Dynasty of Ur 3,000 B.C., and as the date of the fixing of the Sothic Calendar in Egypt, an event of great importance in the history of civilization, 4,236 B.C., that is to say, a thousand years before 'Menes' or the oldest inscribed monuments. He would rank that year as the earliest date in human history.

W. J. Perry, in a recent contribution to *Man* (February, 1929), has pointed out that the most striking characteristic of Sumerian civilization is the presence simultaneously of three different modes of disposal of the dead: burial in a mat in a grave, burial in a clay coffin (*larnax*) in a grave, and burial in a shaft tomb with a *dromos* or stairway. Now the Egyptians, 'starting with the simple grave of the pre-Dynastic period, in which the body was wrapped in a skin or a mat, gradually developed their burial practices until, at the end of the Second Dynasty, they had acquired a series of practices closely similar in every way to those found at Ur in the earliest cemetery.' This, with other things, suggests that Egypt influenced Sumer rather than that Sumer influenced Egypt.

The question of the origin of civilization is further complicated now by recent discoveries in the Indus valley, which, though only known at present from newspaper paragraphs, argue, as V. Gordon Childe says, a true urban civilization where writing and other arts of civilization were already flourishing about 3,000 B.C. The excavations at Harappa and Mohenjo Daro have been taken by some to show that there was on the Indus a

civilization still more advanced than that of Mesopotamia before the middle of the third millennium, and that many of the distinctive elements of Sumerian civilization existed there is a more developed form. Naturally, the question has been raised: Were the higher elements of Sumerian culture derived from India? A system of writing was in use which was still partly pictographic. The signs, which resemble, without being identical with, those used by the Sumerians, have been found stamped on copper bars or engraved on seals.

M.A.C.

THE LIFE OF JESUS.*

This little volume is very welcome, and it is altogether good that the admirable series of little books known as The Home University Library should include it. Dr. Gore's presentation of our Lord differs widely from some recent presentations by literary men; he understands the world-background of his subject, and his material. Anyone who feels that Jesus has vanished beyond recall to knowledge will find Him here set forth with a dignity which owes nothing to conscious literary art or to sentiment.

Bishop Gore first sketches the historical background of the Gospels, and then reconstructs the Galilean ministry of Jesus, showing that His teaching 'was almost wholly ethical.' Even those who are far removed from Dr. Gore in theological outlook will most readily agree that he is a great exponent of the ethical teaching of the Gospels; he understands what he calls, with obvious restraint, 'this fascinating subject.' He then proceeds to relate the story of the rejection and crucifixion of Jesus, down to the burial. So far, except in his chapter on 'The Teaching of Jesus,' Dr. Gore bases his story on that of *St. Mark* and *St. Luke*, making no use of *St. Matthew* and *St. John*. The rest of the book is less satisfying and of less value. Issues are raised which cannot be dealt with in the space available, though the Bishop's opinions about them are well known and easily accessible. He is very reluctant to admit that those who do not accept his estimate of the Gospel tradition can be otherwise than swayed by philosophical presuppositions or prejudices against belief in a full Theism or in the possibility of miracle. There are the usual hard words about those who feel that early Church history and the human myth-making faculty (which, in the presence of great spiritual crises, is a necessity if anything worth preserving is to survive) account for more in the form and content of the Gospel tradition than Bishop Gore personally estimates. There is the familiar 'thus far and no further' air about it. But these characteristics cannot neutralize the effect of the positive value of this little book, which should be read and read again.

J.S.B.

MEN OF THE REVOLUTION.†

Mr. J. M. Thompson, who in the sphere of New Testament criticism failed to reach the conclusions prescribed for scholars by ecclesiastical tradition, has turned his attention to history, of his labours in which sphere this book is a product. It contains eleven very readable and lively biographical sketch of the careers of certain figures which played their part in the Revolution drama. The work has vigour and style besides historical value, and we can heartily recommend it to our readers. 'History,' remarks Mr. Thompson, 'cannot be certain: but the historian can be sincere'; and to disentangle the truth from the cloud of calumny or flattery which political passions generate is no easy task. Were men like Danton, Marat, Robes-

* *Jesus of Nazareth*. By Charles Gore, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D., formerly Bishop of Oxford. (London: Thornton Butterworth, Ltd. Price 2/6 net.)

† *Leaders of the French Revolution*. By J. M. Thompson. (Basil Blackwell. 8/6 net)

pierre angels or devils, doctrinaires or opportunists, idealists or scoundrels? Mr. Thompson presents us with men of like passions with ourselves, yet raised above themselves by their destiny. Sieyès was a clerical don; Mirabeau a cosmopolitan aristocrat; Brissot a middle-class journalist. These citizens had a sense of style, or at least of dramatic effect. When Danton was asked, at his trial, for his name and address, 'My address,' said he, in his immense voice, 'will soon be in nothingness (*le néant*): as for my name, you will find it in the Panthéon of history.' Again, when he stood on the scaffold, and the executioner prevented Hérault, who was to die first, from kissing him: 'Fool!' he roared, 'you can't prevent our heads kissing in the basket.' 'You must show my head to the people,' was his last utterance; 'it is worth it.' It was; for he had a strange physiognomy, defaced by a broken nose. Marat was not in all respects an attractive character, but we must concede to him the virtue (if it be one) of industry. 'I give only two hours out of the twenty-four to sleep, and one to meals, dressing, and household affairs.' The rest of his time was devoted to public business and the editing of his paper. 'I have not taken a quarter of an hour's recreation for more than three years.' Such are the men that make history. Robespierre has become a name of horror, but he had one friend who could write of him afterwards, 'I would have given my life to save Robespierre, whom I loved like a brother. No one knows better than I do how sincere, disinterested, and absolute was his devotion to the Republic. He has become the scapegoat of the revolutionists; but he was the best man of them all.'

Perhaps there is more in common between the Revolution movement, and the movement which produced the Synoptic Gospels, than is sometimes supposed. It is true that the one brought forth Napoleon and the Empire, and the other Hildebrand and the Papacy, but that is the way of the world.

J.C.H.

CREATIVE PERSONALITY AND EVOLUTION.*

We have here a volume of sermons by one whose mind is both theological and scientific, a duality of characteristics essential in these days to the preacher who would say anything worth saying on the things that matter. As an introduction to the sermons the author has included two Papers, one on 'The How and the Why' occasioned by what is called 'the tragi-comedy played in Tennessee, the other on 'Evolution and the Conception of Sin.' The sermons themselves are on such diverse themes as *Freedom, Houses, Marriage, Alms, The Son of Man, The Holy Trinity*. A perusal of such titles would not readily suggest that there is a bond giving unity to the whole. Nevertheless, the author's claim that 'the conception of Creative Personality lies behind them all' seems justified. His main position, as he himself sees it and expresses it, is as follows: 'God is Love. Because of the inner necessity of this, His very Being, God creates, limiting Himself in that creation that His creatures may be free, and may freely turn to Him. Man refused His service—Himself; and this refusal made necessary a further display of His selfless Love. God limited Himself again in the Incarnation, within the region of historic time and place. The Incarnation is thus a second creation, in line with the first.'

Lucidity is not the merit of these sermons, though their concern with aspects of modern thought will conduce to the interest and profit of their readers.

C.J.W.

**Creative Personality and Evolution*. By Stewart A. McDowall, B.D. (S.P.C.K. 1928. 5/-)

CORRESPONDENCE

NON-GRADUATE ORDINANDS.

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*.

SIR,

As a member of the Churchmen's Union working on the staff of two Theological Colleges, where the students are mainly (though not wholly) non-graduates, I desire to protest against an article in your April number entitled 'Thoughts on the Church.'

After stating the fact that many ordinands are receiving financial help for their training, the writer says :

- (a) 'The wrong type is selected,' namely, that 'rabble of the sacristy' from which is evolved 'the seminary trained priestling.'
- (b) 'The training is not only defective but perverted' because (1) the facts of Biblical criticism and Church history are suppressed; (2) subsidies may be withdrawn if a student dares to question the dogmas imposed by the college authorities.

The writer applies these criticisms, so I understand, to the non-graduate colleges, and as a History lecturer at two of such colleges (Salisbury and Warminster) I challenge his statements. I must add that I am a Broad Churchman of avowedly non-sacerdotal views.

(a) We sometimes get candidates whose outlook is that of the sacristy; they are usually an embarrassment to the staff, who view their ordination with dismay. Possibly this type is not altogether unknown at colleges other than 'non-graduate.' But the majority of ordinands known to me are not of this type; many have had a hard struggle to qualify (by working after business hours) for the matriculation standard which all colleges now demand; some have given up attractive posts in order to prepare for the uncertain, and often thankless, work of the parochial ministry. Applied to such men, phrases like 'rabble of the sacristy' are an insult that I should not have expected from *The Modern Churchman*.

(b) At the colleges with which I am acquainted the facts of Biblical criticism and Church history are not suppressed; and more than one lecturer known to me has had to face an accusation of 'heresy' based upon the reports of shocked pupils who may or may not be of the 'sacristy' type.

I have never heard of any student losing a grant because he refused to accept the theology of his tutors; but doubtless the writer of this article had evidence for such a statement, and it would be interesting to learn what colleges permit such tyranny.

No one engaged in work at a theological college, whether graduate or non-graduate, will deny that some candidates are inferior, but the same could be said of those in training at any University for any profession.

Again, some colleges are tied to one or other of those theological parties whose exclusive attitude your readers deplore; but, so far as my experience goes (and since the war I have been in close touch with many ordinands), there is a wider outlook at most colleges than the mere partisan would approve; perhaps it is significant that an admittedly 'Broad' Churchman can work happily on the staff of two colleges commonly reputed to be 'High' in their tendencies.

Finally, whatever be the defects of the non-graduate or other theological colleges, they do not justify such phrases as those quoted from your magazine. Such an article, indeed, goes some way to justify the reproach that a liberal Churchman can sometimes be as unfair and as bitter-tongued as other partisans of whose intolerance we complain.

I have written this letter on my own initiative, and it only represents the opinion of one individual; but I think it right to say openly that one member of the Churchmen's Union regrets that you should have published an article which he considers to be unworthy of the ideals connoted by the term 'Broad Churchman.'

J. F. CLAYTON.

The Theological College, Salisbury.

April 29, 1929.

We are heartily glad that the facts, at least so far as two of our non-graduate Theological Colleges are concerned, are as Mr. Clayton states. We regret that the tone of our article was such as to have caused him pain.—ED., M.C.]

THEOLOGICAL COLLEGE,
SALISBURY.

NON-GRADUATE ORDINANDS.

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*.

SIR,

The April number of the *Modern Churchman* contains an article entitled 'Thoughts on the Church,' in which are set forth a series of comments on Theological Colleges. They bring such grave charges against the authorities of these Colleges that I must ask, as Chairman of the Conference of Principals of Theological Colleges, to be allowed to reply to them. I may add that a long experience divided between two graduate Colleges and one which receives both graduates and non-graduates entitles me to claim some knowledge of the facts.

The Colleges welcome criticism which is constructive from any quarter. It is not easy to maintain the standard against the pressure of the needs of parishes which call for men to be sent to them quickly. But anyone engaged in the work, and familiar with the deliberations of the Central Advisory Council of Training for the Ministry, is well aware that there has been a steady levelling up since the war. This does not prevent frequent misrepresentation of the methods adopted in the Colleges. But the only point in which the assailants appear to be agreed is in the consistent refusal to accept any invitation to come and stay in a College and see for themselves. They prefer the scholastic habit of arguing from preconceived premises to the modern scientific way of induction.

The article in question points out that many non-graduate candidates are subsidised. (So are many graduates for the matter of that.) They are then described by the term 'rabble,' an observation with a true ring of Sadducee contempt. But the writer is kind enough to add that this type of candidate 'merits our sympathy. He is entirely at the mercy of the College authorities, who may cast him off any day.' But this punishment is likely to be inflicted, not so much for offences against discipline, as for originality of thought. The Principals have each his own standard of orthodoxy, and the amount of financial assistance awarded to each

candidate is in proportion to his nearness to or distance from that standard. The student dare not think independently for fear of losing his bursary.

That this picture—not even probable enough to be called a caricature—of Principals threatening men with the dictum, ‘Agree with me or be mulcted,’ should appear in the pages of the *Modern Churchman* is only another sad proof that the odium theologicum recognises no part of the religious press as immune from its ravages. Or is it that the writer of such an article regards the edifying precepts from Erasmus and Burke, which appear on the cover, as having the capacity of Elisha’s meal to neutralise any virus which may be within? A very little consideration of detail will show the groundlessness of his charge. A student entering his name for a College fills up a form about himself. Do these forms commonly contain some question about the orthodoxy of the candidate? I have never seen one. But if they do not how does the Principal decide that ‘X’ is sound enough to have a bursary, but that ‘Y’ is not? And what evidence is there for the expulsion of candidates from Colleges on the ground that their views did not please the Principal? It must be remembered that this accusation involves others besides the Principals. Many of the bursaries come from Central Funds, and to suggest that the men who have for some years given much care to the painstaking distribution of these funds are the willing abettors of this alleged bigotry of the Principals is to offer a gratuitous affront to workers to whom the Church owes much.

The article goes on to enquire, ‘Do these seminaries supply the students with clear ideas on the critical study of the New Testament, or on the history of dogmas or institutions?’ and adds ‘The facts are distorted or concealed.’ Has the writer made any attempt to ascertain what books are used in Theological Colleges? If he has, he presumably considers that distortion and concealment of the truth are assisted by the reading of such authors as Rashdall, Streeter, Galloway, Bethune Baker, or Matthews, to name but a few of those to whom lecturers in the Colleges refer their students.

I have had a share in the training of more than five hundred candidates for Holy Orders. Among them have been many non-graduates. My general impression is that these men are more in touch with the realities of life than were the ordinands of any class in pre-war days. And I wish I could convey in print the great respect inspired by the courage with which so many of them have overcome their difficulties, and attained to levels intellectual as well as spiritual, of which no one need be ashamed. To one who has seen this it is impossible to be silent when these men are treated as deserving nothing better than to become cannon fodder for ecclesiastical journalists. Matthew Arnold once quoted a French author, who spoke of what he termed ‘la brutalité des journaux anglais.’ I am one of those who would certainly not deny the value of the Modernist contribution to theology, and I should be sorry to have to rewrite the above sentence by substituting ‘modernistes’ for ‘anglais.’ But Johannes Agricola has his counterpart in Modernist as well as in other circles, and it needs to be said with some plainness that progress is in no way helped by the assumption of some Modernist writers that teachers and learners, because they are of another school, have neither enough honesty to desire to find the truth nor enough intelligence to grasp it.

C. T. DIMONT.

April 30th, 1929.